E. H. Stiick & Son
SCRANTON BOOK EXCHANGE
312 N. Washington Ave.
SCRANTON, PA.

G. M. ELLIOTT LIBRARY
CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY
2700 GLENWAY AVE.
P. O. BOX 04320
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45204-3200

THE CALL TO UNITY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

THE CALL TO UNITY

THE BEDELL LECTURES FOR 1919
DELIVERED AT KENYON COLLEGE
MAY 24TH AND 25TH, 1920

BY
WILLIAM T. MANNING, S.T.D., D.C.L.
Rector of Trinity Church, New York

GEORGE MARK ELLIOTT LIBRARY
The Cincinnati Bible Seminary

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1920

All rights reserved

Copyright, 1920,
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Set up and electrotyped. Published, December, 1920

TO

WILLIAM PORCHER DuBOSE

WHO

BY HIS LIFE

NOT LESS THAN BY HIS TEACHING

HELPED MANY TO KNOW

JESUS CHRIST

AS

THE WAY, THE TRUTH AND THE LIFE

PREFACE

These lectures, delivered some months ago, were put in form for publication before the recent meeting of the Lambeth Conference. That gathering of the Bishops of the Anglican Church has issued a Declaration on Reunion which will challenge the attention of Christians everywhere, and will give new impetus to the movement towards unity.

To the author of these lectures it is reassuring to find that what had been written is wholly in accord with this latest pronouncement by those entitled to speak for the Anglican Communion. Especially it is interesting to find that the suggestion, in the fourth lecture, as to mutual acceptance of added authorization for the work of the Ministry, is definitely put forth in the Lambeth Declaration.

Among the volumes consulted in connection with these lectures there are two to which I feel under special obligation. One of these is *The Church and Religious Unity,* by the Revd. Herbert Kelly, a masterly and most truly helpful discussion of the subject from the Catholic point of view; the other is *Pathways to Christian Unity,* by six distinguished Free Church writers, a volume so earnest in its plea for unity, and so Christian in its spirit, that it is a refreshment to one's faith and hope to read it.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	The Call to Unity	1
II	The Present Outlook for Unity	27
III	The Approach to Unity	57
IV	The Call to the Anglican Communion	83

"As being baptized we are all on either side brothers and sisters in Christ, we are all at bottom members of the universal Church. In this great garden of God let us shake hands with one another over the confessional hedges, and let us break them down so as to be able to embrace one another altogether. . . . Let us examine, compare and investigate the matter together, and we shall discover the precious pearl of religious peace and Church unity, and then join our hands and forces in cleansing and cultivating the garden of the Lord, which is overgrown with weeds."

JOHN J. I. VON DOLLINGER.

The Church is divinely organized and constituted Unity — a unity within which by free interrelation and interaction different points of view, impressions, emphases, perspectives, and so theories, doctrines, systems, etc., may correct, supplement, and complete one another and bring all to the essential and sufficient unity that not only belongs to them but can come only through their all-sided contributions.

Incidentally we may say of Sects in Christianity that their evil is expressed in the word itself: they are organized and isolated differences and diversities. Their partial and emphasized good is withdrawn from communication to and influence upon others; their deficiencies, ignorances or errors are removed from supplementing or correction by others. They are destructive of that Oneness in Christ which is the essence and definition of Christianity, which is ours in spite of our differences, and within which our differences would quickly melt down into not merely pardonable, or permissible, but even contributory and completive diversities.

WILLIAM PORCHER DUBOSE.

THE CALL TO UNITY

I

THE CALL TO UNITY

THE whole world to-day is moved by the thought of fellowship. It is not surprising therefore that we feel more than ever the incongruity of our lack of fellowship in the Christian Church. The desire for fellowship among Christians has in fact reached a new point of progress. It has ceased to be merely a pious aspiration, and has become a world wide movement. Never since the divisions in the Church of Christ took place has the need of reunion been felt as it is now. And this necessity is being forced home upon us from many sides. Hard facts are driving us to see the evils, and the perils of our present situation.

The outbreak of the world war burned into our souls the weakness of a divided Christianity. We saw that, as a power to preserve peace among men, the Church did not seriously count. Its voice was not heard speaking unitedly and clearly for those principles of justice and righteousness upon which alone peace can rest. Its influence in the hour of the world's crisis was negli-

gible. And the whole course of events since has served to make this inadequacy clearer to us. Whatever explanation, or defense, or palliation there may be for them, it is plain that our divisions are a disaster to the cause of Christ. Before the present unprecedented need of the world, the Christian Church stands with her life enfeebled, her witness weakened, her message in large measure discredited by her own differences and dissensions.

Christian Unity is no mere ecclesiastical problem. It is the greatest, and the most far reaching of all present day questions. It lies back of, and holds the key to, all our other problems, national and international, social, political and economic. As men face the tremendous responsibilities and tasks of this new time, they are feeling the need of support and guidance. They know that if there is to be a new order it must be filled with a new spirit. They are looking for moral and spiritual strength and help. But they are not looking, with confidence, to the Church for this. A disunited Church cannot call forth the faith of men, nor give the message of Christ to the world. Its own inconsistency, and self-contradiction are too evident. How can the world learn the Gospel of fellowship from an organization which is at variance with itself? What power is there in an appeal for a united world issued by a divided Church? What force is there in a plea for brotherhood by those who fail to give evidence of brotherli-

ness? Such an appeal suggests at once the retort: "Physician, heal thyself."

The Christian Church is commissioned to show the world the true meaning of human brotherhood. It is for this that the Church is set here among men. It is to preach and to be, the truest realization of fellowship ever seen on this earth; a fellowship which transcends all bounds of nation, or race, or color; a fellowship blessed, made holy and complete, in oneness with Jesus Christ. This fellowship was to be the proof of the Church's Divine mission and of the power of Him in Whose Name she speaks. While the Church fails to furnish this proof, can we wonder if the world listens to her message with doubt and uncertainty?

The Church should be the inspiration and guiding force of the present movements for social advance. Changes far greater than any of us realize are taking place. We have entered into a new era. Vast problems are pressing for solution. The truer order of coöperation, fellowship, brotherhood is to be established. In all this the Church should be not a spectator, nor a mere sympathetic influence, but the great guiding power. The one true hope for the world is that these movements shall be actuated by the spirit, and the principles, of Christ. There should now be a world-wide call from the Church for a redeemed social order, in which the spirit and law of Christ shall rule, for the bringing of Christian principles into the whole

fabric of modern civilization; for the Christianization of every department of life. Who but the Church can issue such a call? What other power but that of religion is able to bring the spirit of brotherhood into human relationships and "to make justice and love the controlling motive in all social conditions"? But her own divided state makes it impossible for the Church to give such a call with effect. "Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter?" Can a Church which is divided by the spirit of sect liberate men's hearts from the spirit of class and of caste? Can a Church which maintains barriers of religious antagonism and division be the herald of coöperation, and of the common life? Can a Church in which men are separated into competitive and rival groups preach effectively the social message of the Gospel? In his interesting essay on "Christianity and the Working Classes," Mr. Arthur Henderson very pointedly asks "Is Christianity, as we have it represented to-day, split up as it is into almost innumerable denominational churches, capable of dealing adequately with the growing forces of reaction?" and he adds: "However much Christians may console themselves that a Church divided into numerous sects is justified and, as many think, a source of strength, the multitude is slow to believe in a Christianity so divided." [1]

[1] *Christianity and the Working Classes,* pp. 125, 126.

Of the practical waste, the squandering of energy, time and resources, occasioned by our divisions it is scarcely necessary to speak. We see the evidences of this on every hand. It is obvious that the energies which, as Christians, we devote to controversy and conflict with each other should be concentrated on the one great purpose for which the Church exists. But the overlapping, the duplication of effort, the competition and rivalry among Christians are worse than mere waste of power, serious as this is. They are a spectacle which lessens the faith of men, which brings religion into disrepute, and which does daily hurt to the cause of Christ. Men generally are not hostile to religion, but the message of Christ seems to them confused and uncertain. Amid the controversies of the churches they cannot hear the great central message of the Church. The fact which they see clearly is that, however the divisions may be accounted for, they conflict with the Church's own teaching, and contradict her own fundamental principles. They know that whatever else the Church of Christ stands for it must, if it truly represents Him, stand for harmony, not for discord, for peace, not for dissension, for fellowship, brotherhood and love. A divided Church is giving us a non-believing world.

Here in the United States, in the life of our own country, the practical results of the disunity among Christians are only too apparent. One of its most

serious results is the complete divorce of religion from our system of public education. This land in which we live is a Christian land. It was the distinct intention of its founders that it should be such. As Bishop Gailor reminds us, in his Bedell Lectures, this nation "was founded by Christian men with the deliberate purpose of extending the influence of the Christian religion," and the Supreme Court of the United States has specifically declared that the Christian Religion is part of the common law of our country.[1] It was George Washington who said "Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." . . . "To the distinguished character of patriot it should be our highest glory to add the more distinguished character of Christian." And yet we cannot teach the children in our public schools even the bare rudiments of the Christian religion. The religious divisions among us forbid our doing so.

The whole fabric of democracy is based on belief in God. Everything is staked on the right judgment and moral principle of the people. Education alone does not give moral principle. A trained intellect has no necessary connection with right conduct. There is no other basis for moral conduct except religion. The distinction between right and wrong disappears, or becomes a mere convention, if we cease to recog-

[1] *The Christian Church and Education*, p. 48.

nize God and His law. But as to this upon which the character of our people, and the life of our country depend, our schools are compelled to keep silence. Children are influenced more by what we do than by what we say. And between our provision for them in regard to education and our provision for them in regard to religion they see a contrast which cannot fail to impress them. They see their education carefully provided for by the State, and religion carefully excluded. With their companions, on six days in each week, they enter the door of the one schoolhouse; on the other day they go in separated groups, if they go at all, to differing, and rival, religious teachers. As to education they see visible unity; as to religion they see visible dissension and disunity. A member of the Board of Education of the city of New York was reported recently as saying, "We fully understand that a system of education from which God and religion are excluded provides only for a civilization which must crumble to pieces." And it is the divisions among Christians which are compelling us to maintain such a system.

It was no religious partisan, but the late Thomas H. Huxley, who wrote, "I have always been strongly in favor of secular education, in the sense of education without theology; but I confess I have been no less seriously perplexed to know by what practical measures the religious feeling, which is the essential

basis of right conduct, was to be kept up, in the present utterly chaotic state of opinion upon these matters, without the use of the Bible."

We are not willing even to entertain the thought that America may cease to be a Christian nation. But the facts are such as may well give us grave concern. Human society does not remain Christian of its own inherent impulse, without pains or effort. Christian faith and principle do not persist of their own momentum. Fruits do not continue without roots. The United States Census of 1916 shows two hundred and two different religious denominations. But in our population of more than one hundred million people less than forty-two million acknowledge connection with any kind of religion. Trustworthy statistics show that an actually incredible number of the young people of our land are growing up without definite religious teaching of any sort. A volume, just published, by Charles Otis Gill and Gifford Pinchot, gives the results of a careful investigation of conditions in the rural districts of the State of Ohio. This report reveals a decline, both religiously and morally, which is startling, and the situation is shown to be worst in that portion of the State where the American stock predominates and the foreign born population is small.

"In this area," the authors say, "after more than a hundred years of the work of the Churches, the re-

ligious, social, and economic welfare of the people is going down. Although the Churches have been here for more than a century, no normal type of organized religion is really flourishing, while the only kind which, during the past fifteen years, has been gaining ground — the cult of the Holy Rollers — is scarcely better than that of a dervish. The Churches have failed, and are failing, to dispel ignorance and superstition, to prevent the increase of vice, the spread of disease, and the general moral and spiritual decadence of the people. Imbeciles, feeble-minded, and delinquents are numerous, politics is corrupt, the selling of votes is common, petty crimes abound, the schools have been badly managed and poorly attended. Cases of rape, assault, and robbery are of almost weekly occurrence within five minutes' walk of one of the county seats, while in another county political control is held by a self-confessed criminal." [1]

There is no reason to suppose that conditions in Ohio are exceptionally bad. On the contrary, this State was selected as the field for investigation because it is central and representative, its country districts contain great numbers of churches, the average for the State is in fact one church for every two hundred and eighty persons, its religious life includes all the stronger denominations, and has been established for a century. In the eighteen counties investigated

[1] *Six Thousand Churches,* Macmillan and Co.

there are, in two hundred and eight rural townships, fifteen hundred and forty-two churches, divided among seventeen different denominations. It is not the failure of Protestantism that we see here, nor the failure of Catholicism. It is the failure of both. It is the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of a divided Christianity. What is the picture of the Christian religion which is presented week by week to our people in what is called the "religious page" of our daily papers? In that exhibit of rival religious agencies, varying in their teaching from Roman Catholicism at one end of the list to Spiritism, Christian Science and New Thought at the other, does the average American see a sight to inspire him with faith in the Gospel of Christ? Could anything be more confusing to the minds, or less assuring to the faith of men, than the spectacle there offered to them? And yet this Babel of discordant voices is a photographic representation of what we venture to call "our common Christianity." The plain man may be forgiven if he can see in it little that is either "common" or Christian. It is a picture which casts doubt and discredit on Christ and His Gospel. If Christ cannot bring His own followers together in fellowship and brotherhood, how can men believe in His power? If Christians are unable to agree among themselves as to the essential truth of the Gospel is it surprising if the world is un-

convinced, or if men conclude that all questions of belief are unimportant?

Even within the household of the various Communions the effect of our present divided state is deeply felt. The faith of the whole body of Christians is weakened and impaired by it. Great numbers of those who were brought up in these different faiths are adrift, without clear religious belief, or definite conviction. Many of those whose parents were earnest Christians, and whose family names have long been on the records of the Church, are to be found in the ranks of the apparently indifferent. In the battle against the evil that is in the world, against the anti-Christian forces at work in the intellectual world, against the spirit of pure paganism now manifesting itself in our literature, in our art, in the present standards, or lack of standards, in much of our social life, we need the testimony and the power of a united Christianity. Our divisions are giving the forces of evil and unbelief a terrible advantage.

But if our disunity weakens and stultifies the work of the Church here in our own land, where we are familiar with the disputes, and know something of their history, what shall be said of its effect in the Mission fields, in the work of world-evangelization? The question is one which answers itself. Here the inconsistency of our divided state, and the harm

wrought by it, come out into full view. Why should those who know nothing of the Gospel listen to us until we can agree among ourselves as to what is its essential message? What success would the first missionaries, the Apostles themselves, have had if they had gone out from Jerusalem disagreeing as to the common Faith, refusing to hold communion with each other, carrying rival and conflicting messages in the Name of the one Christ? From every quarter of the globe, the devoted men and women who are giving their lives as missionaries send back to us the same testimony. They tell us that if Christ is to be made known to the heathen world the divisions among Christians must cease, that they are the greatest of all hindrances, a practically insuperable obstacle, to the carrying out of our Lord's command to "make disciples of all the nations."

The Bishop of Dornakal, the only native of India in the Anglican Episcopate, gives us a vivid picture of the situation. Stating that there are one hundred million people in India beyond the reach of any existing missionary agency, and deploring the waste of effort caused by unnecessary multiplication of missions in the same district, the Bishop declared a few weeks ago that if there could be a union of spiritual forces this would soon result in doubling the number of Christians in India. In his address as reported, the Bishop said: "Another evil of the present state of

things was the confusion created in the minds of non-Christian Indians. Again and again he had been asked by educated Indians to explain our differences. Again and again he had tried to tell them we are all one, but always he was conscious that they saw two churches within one hundred yards. In the large towns when a Hindoo became a Christian there was a real competition between the various bodies of Christians to convince him that theirs was the one true representation of Christianity. Converts had told him that they were happy enough after their conversion until their baptism, but as this drew near the quarrels amongst Christian ministers as each sought to obtain them almost made them draw back. . . . There are many Indians who would have Christ but will have nothing to do with Christianity that has come from the West, because of the bitterness and rivalry it has brought with it."

The thought of unity may well be in our minds. The disastrous consequences of our divisions are all too clear. The most hopeful feature of the existing situation is that earnest Christians everywhere are realizing its hopelessness. We see the Christian Church disqualified for her task of world-service, unable to speak with a corporate voice, without power to meet the deep needs, and the magnificent opportunities which now confront her. We see the waste of power and resources, the over-churching and the under-churching, the jealousies and unholy rivalries which

result from the present state of things. We see the faith of men lessened, their minds confused as to the message of the Gospel, the Church's own spiritual life weakened and impoverished, her vision of the truth narrowed and restricted.

We see all this, and more, as the practical result of the dissensions and divisions within the Christian family. But unanswerable as the argument for reunion is from the practical side this is not the only, nor the chief, ground of its appeal to us. For all believing Christians there is a call to unity higher, and more sacred, than this.

It is not sufficient for us to base the appeal for unity only on the lower grounds of expediency, or of economy, or of more effective ministration. We fall far short of the truth and of its full claim upon us if we rest the case here. Our desire for unity has a deeper source, our hope for it a surer foundation than our own wisdom and judgment, our sense of loss through our divisions, or our feeling that unity would be practically advantageous. Unity is not merely some plan, or scheme, or vision of ours. The call to unity is from Christ Himself, and therefore it comes with compelling power to all Christians, Catholic and Protestant alike. This is the fact which we all need to have more clearly before us. And this fact is now being recognized with new clearness by Christians of all names. In a most helpful and noteworthy volume en-

titled *Pathways to Christian Unity,* six distinguished and representative ministers of the English Free Churches, unite in the following statement: "A more careful reading of the Gospels has made it clear that our present divisions are contrary to the mind of Christ, and that unity is implicit in the very idea of the Church. As Christ formed it, the Church was one, even as the Gospel is one, and God is one. A thorough-going examination of the Acts and the Epistles has left it beyond doubt that in the Apostolic Church, amid considerable diversity of type and polity, unity was regarded as an essential note, a unity spiritual first but also visible and effective." . . . "We are not dealing then with a question of convenience merely, with a utilitarian arrangement, to save overlapping and wasteful rivalry. We are concerned with something deeper; the more adequate expression of the spiritual reality; the fulfilment of the divine purpose. The Apostles and members of the early Church rightly apprehended the mind of Christ in this matter. The New Testament and all its writers bear a consistent witness to the unity of the Church. Diligence was exercised in keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and great pains were taken to prevent division." . . . "This exposition of the teaching and practice of New Testament times has for us far more than an academic interest. The mind of Christ is regulative; His will is commanding. If we believe

that our Lord meant us to be all in a visible fellowship, we dare not rest in our state of disunion. The rallying point for united Christendom is common loyalty to the leadership of our Lord." [1] Careful and open minded study of the New Testament will, as these writers say, make clear to any of us that it is Christ's will that His Church shall be one.

It is from Christ Himself that the call comes to us.

In His last prayer on earth for His disciples, recorded in the seventeenth chapter of St. John's Gospel, the petition "that they all may be one" is four times repeated. It is often urged that in this prayer our Lord had in mind the inner unity of the Spirit which should bind His disciples together, and beyond question this is true. But it is clear also that He had in mind a unity of the Spirit which was to be visibly manifested. The oneness of His followers is to be the evidence to the world of His Divine power and mission. He prays not for a unity which is invisible but for a unity which men shall see and which shall bring them to belief in Him. His prayer to the Father for His disciples is "that they also may be one in Us; *that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.*" And the acts of Christ are in accord with His prayer. He not only prays, He also provides, that the spiritual unity of His disciples shall have visible expression. He forms a society into which all His

[1] Pp. 22, 25, 26. Macmillan and Co.

followers are to be gathered, and this society He calls His Church. This society which our Lord Himself forms is both inward and outward, both spiritual and visible. It is a Kingdom of the Spirit, a Kingdom "within you," but it has also tangible existence and embodiment. Our Lord chooses and trains its first officers, appoints its visible observances, the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper which are to be continued forever, and promises to be with it "always, even unto the end of the world." This was the Church of the New Testament as all the first disciples knew it, and were gathered into it. The New Testament knows nothing of "churches," except as local parts of the one Church founded by Christ Himself. Saint Paul leaves us in no doubt as to what this fact of the one Church, the one Spirit manifested in one Body, the visible fellowship of all believers in Christ means to him.

We think of St. Paul, rightly, as the great Apostle of Christian liberty, but he is equally, and even more distinctively, the Apostle of Christian unity. To St. Paul this fact of the Church is of the very essence of the Gospel. In the Church he sees, as indeed do all the New Testament writers, the actual carrying into effect, the practical realization of that which Christ came into this world to do.

The Church is the means which God has appointed for bringing to Himself all mankind, in the fellowship

of His dear Son. It is the Church which gives the Gospel actuality and meaning. As St. Paul sees and understands them Christ and His Church cannot be separated. On the way to Damascus, the persecutor of the Church, he has heard the voice saying "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou *Me?*" To St. Paul the Church is not something apart from, or additional to the Gospel, a voluntary association of those who believe formed for convenience or effectiveness in work. The Church is an integral part of the Gospel, inseparable from it, and necessary to its life. Without it the Gospel would itself be incomplete and unintelligible. The Church is Jesus Christ Himself still alive, still present, still manifested in the fellowship of those who believe in Him and are joined to Him by the Spirit. As St. Paul contemplates this truth, and lives it, the wonder of it increases, the depth of its meaning grows upon him. He can find no language sufficient, no terms strong enough, to give it expression. His words burn and glow as we read them. He adds phrase to phrase, and figure to figure, in the effort to make clear its revelation of God's goodness and love. His great desire is to make all men see "what is the exceeding greatness of His power to us who believe, according to the working of His mighty power, which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead and set Him at His own right hand in heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and

might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." [1]

The Church, St. Paul tells us, is the body of the living Christ. Christ and His Church are not two, they are one. The Church can only be one, because it is the body of the one Christ. It is the living fellowship of all who share Christ's life, all who by the Spirit are made one with Him. It is the unity of all who are His, both in this world and in Paradise. There can no more be two Churches than there can be two Christs. Christians may fail to recognize, or may deny, their fellowship in Christ, but it still exists, and in this lies the deep wrong of division. This is the basic, fundamental truth which St. Paul sees and declares with such power. The Gospel means not only that which took place at Bethlehem, and that which was done on Calvary, it means the embodiment and manifestation of the risen and ascended Christ in the visible fellowship of His followers, in whom, by the power of the Holy Ghost He continues His life and work in this world. The very proof of the Gospel is its power to bind men and women of every sort together in a new life of fellowship with Christ and with

[1] Ephesians i, 19–23.

each other. The Apostle will hear of nothing which obscures this, or weakens it, or conflicts with it. In the striking words of a well known New Testament scholar " the great struggle of his life was not to claim permission for Gentiles to form Gentile churches side by side with the Jewish Churches but to preserve the completest inter-communion between Jewish and Gentile believers in Christ. It was the refusal of Jews to eat with Gentiles — a refusal which must have necessitated separate eucharists — which he denounced as fundamentally unchristian, when even St. Peter and St. Barnabas for a moment lent it their sanction."

" St. Paul's whole career was shaped by his conviction and determination that comprehension and unity were and should be essential notes of the Christian Church. Not far an instant could he allow the position that the city of Antioch might contain two bodies of baptized persons, agreeing in their Christian faith, recipients of the same Holy Ghost, and yet separated from communion with one another in the breaking of bread. Two bodies and one spirit was a thought unthinkable to him. ' There is neither Jew nor Greek,' he cries to the Galatians, to whom he has repeated the story of that crisis, ' there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bondman nor freeman, there is no male and female; for ye are all one — one man — in Christ Jesus.' " [1]

[1] *The Vision of Unity,* by J. Armitage Robinson, pp. 17, 18.

No one has ever urged the call to unity and its claim upon all Christians with such power, and passion, as St. Paul does. If the great Apostle were now here with us in the flesh there is no question as to what his counsel would be to us.

In the confusion and weakness of our disunity his words come to us to-day as a ringing challenge. "I hear that there be divisions among you." "Is Christ divided?" "Mark them which cause divisions." "I beseech you brethren by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you." "For as the body is one and hath many members, but all the members of the body, many though they be, are one body, so also is the Christ: for by one Spirit have we all been baptized into one body."

The facts as to our present condition, and the plain New Testament teaching as to the Church would seem to leave us without apology or defense for the continuance of our divisions. We must win back all of us the vision of the Church of Christ as St. Paul sees it and shows it to us, the Church Divinely founded to be the pillar and ground of the truth, the dispenser of heavenly grace, the Body and the Bride of Christ. It is this New Testament, Divinely given ideal of the Church which is needed to draw us all together, and fill us with longing for the full realization, and manifestation, of our fellowship in the one

Lord. It is not enough for us to go on faithfully and passively in our separated Communions. As Christians we have no right to acquiesce in conditions as they are. It is time for all of us to realize that, while we owe a proper loyalty to our own Communions, our supreme loyalty is due to the one Church, the Body of Christ, into which we are baptized, and of which we are all members. Our separations and divisions have led many of us to a poor and inadequate view of the Church. They have led some of us even to suspicion and depreciation of it, as though loyalty to the Church might in some way come between us and Christ. There is a demand in some quarters for a Christianity without the Church. Nothing could be more out of harmony with the teaching of St. Paul, and of the whole New Testament. The one Church has been too much hidden from us by "the churches." The Free Church writers of the book *Pathways to Christian Unity,* already quoted, say, "It is small wonder that the vision of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church is obscured. Amid our preoccupations with sectional interests, and our emphasis on denominational differences, we cannot be surprised that among a great body of churchmen the idea of the Church no longer kindles imagination, nor evokes warm affection." . . . "The removal of our denominational walls would increase the ranges

of our vision, and bring into clearer focus the one Church of Christ in all its majesty and glory."

There may be those who can regard the present divided state of the Church with indifference. There may even be those who prefer that things should remain as they are, who fear the power that a United Church might exercise in the world. And for that fear there may be good ground. A Church united in the Spirit of Christ would exercise a power such as that which the Gospel showed in the first days. It is quite true that a "half pagan civilization has less to fear from a divided and distracted church." [1]

But to all who believe in Christ as the Redeemer and Lord of human life, the one and only Saviour of the world, the present situation is an intolerable one.

It is Christ's will that is thwarted, it is Christ's power that is circumscribed, it is Christ's promises that are discredited, by the present condition of His Church. Our divisions are not only waste, and loss, and weakness; they are sin.

Men do not listen to the Gospel because we are withholding from them the chief evidence of its power. They do not see the evidence which our Lord Himself said would convince them, and on which St. Paul so insistently dwells, the one body of be-

[1] See essay on "Reunion and the War" in *Towards Reunion*, p. 341.

lievers, linked together in visible and holy fellowship by the power of the one Spirit. Evangelization, Witness, Redemption from sin, Fellowship with God in Christ, these are the things for which the Church exists in this world, and these are all being hindered and defeated by the Church's divisions. Our disunity is sin, and it is sin in which we are all of us involved. We are all guilty of the sin of schism. "We are all more or less schismatic. If not wilfully, then by misfortune, or by the fault of others, we are divided from one another in the Body of Christ." [1] The time has come for repentance in which we must all share. This is a day for great searchings of heart, but it is our own hearts that we must search and not our neighbors'. We need not inquire too diligently into the causes of the divisions, nor seek to apportion the blame for them. The question before us is not how did the divisions begin, but how may they be brought to an end. In most quarrels there are faults on both sides, and so it has been with the quarrels among Christians. The question now is not as to the origin of schism, but as to the longer continuance of it. What is out attitude, and the attitude of our respective Communions towards this question?

Is our personal pride, or our corporate self-satisfaction, hindering the coming of unity, and postponing the day when the power of Christ can be revealed?

[1] *Unity and Schism,* by T. A. Lacey, p. 150.

How much is our attitude governed by prejudice, by dislike of change, by unwillingness to look on the things of others, by the temper of schism in our own souls? How truly do we long for the unity of Christ's Church, and how ready are we to make sacrifices of our preferences and prejudices for it? These are serious questions for all of us to answer, and they are questions from which none of us can escape. The day has passed in which self-sufficient aloofness, or exclusiveness, or indifference could be excused. No such attitude on the part of any of us is now justifiable. Each Christian Communion is called upon to acknowledge its share in the sin of making schism, or of helping to perpetuate it. There is no Church on earth, Catholic or Protestant, which is not a sharer in this sin. There is not a Church which has done all that it should have done to prevent it, or to bring it to an end. It is the profound, and devout, Roman Catholic, Moehler, who declares that Catholics and Protestants "must stretch a friendly hand to one another and exclaim, in the consciousness of a common guilt, we all have erred — it is the Church only which cannot err; we all have sinned — the Church only is spotless on earth"; and he adds, "This open confession of guilt on both sides will be followed by the festival of reconciliation." [1] We are called to repent, and repentance, if it be real, includes full pur-

[1] *La Symbolique,* tome ii, pp. 33, 34.

pose of amendment, and active effort to repair the wrong. It is time now for a great resolve, by Christians of all names, that the present situation shall not continue, that through the promised help of God the Spirit, present with us now as in the first days, the way shall be found for the healing of our divisions, and for the manifestation to the world of our fellowship in Jesus Christ.

II

THE PRESENT OUTLOOK FOR UNITY

THERE are few, to-day, who will defend the divisions among Christians. Not often do we hear the argument, once common enough, that competition is needful for religion, and that sectarianism is ordained of God. It is now generally recognized that the divisions among us are a sin in themselves and a source of untold injury to the cause of Christ. But there are still many who doubt whether the ideal of unity can be realized. The obstacles in the way of its realization are indeed great. From the human point of view we may admit that they seem insuperable. But this is not a question to be considered merely from the human point of view. It is Jesus Christ Who calls us to unity, and with Him the impossible is possible. The difficulty of bringing men and women into fellowship with each other in Christ is no greater now than it was when the Gospel was first preached. That which God the Spirit was able to accomplish in human lives in the first age He is equally able to accomplish in this later one. The reunion of the Church in this twentieth century would be not one whit more

wonderful, or surprising, than was the appearance of the Church in the first century. The difficulties today are, in fact, far less than those which St. Paul faced when he proclaimed the Gospel of visible fellowship in the one Christ. "What a strange medley it was, that Corinthian Church of his! Jew and Gentile, master and slave, cultured and unwashed, were welded into the closest unity by their baptism into this new society. History could produce nothing like it. Slaves had suddenly found themselves on a spiritual level with their owners; emancipated women had begun to prophesy in the common assembly, to the scandal of old-fashioned disciplinarians; there was a babel of tongues as each individual claimed priority for the exercise of his spiritual gift. How could such a conglomerate hold together? Only, St. Paul said, as they recognized an organic life which duly related part with part, only as they were dominated by the truth of the one Body. . . . The body is Christ. That is the true unity. It unites all classes, and all nationalities. It finds a place for everyone, and keeps everyone in his place. It destroys not individuals, but individualism. It transmutes self-assertion into self-devotion. It counts charity, that is the spirit of membership, above all other spiritual gifts. It creates an efficiency and generates a force which transcends all efforts of all individuals, and which in the end will be irresistible. It presents a living Christ to the world — a living and

growing Christ, embodied in the lives of His members, gathering up in one all the individuals of humanity into the ultimate unity of God's One Man. And so it offers a new philosophy of human life, and with it a new human hope, as certain of fulfilment as is the purpose of God." [1] As we consider the practical possibility of unity, and the steps necessary for its achievement, we must keep in mind the fact that unity is far from meaning uniformity. A mechanical uniformity would be as untrue to the New Testament ideal of the Church as is an individualistic disunity. The one would be as far from the true unity of the Spirit as the other is. The one would be as spiritually sterile as the other is spiritually disintegrating. The method of a unity maintained by authority from without has already been tried on a great scale, and our present disunity is the reaction from it. Uniformity in the details of faith and worship there neither can be, nor should be, in the Church. God has created men with widely differing temperaments, gifts, and spiritual capacities. Our gifts and capacities are not to be repressed, they are all to be developed and fulfilled in fellowship with Christ. A true unity must provide for great diversity of spiritual apprehension, experience and expression. Unity requires uniformity only in the things which are essential to common

[1] J. Armitage Robinson, D.D. *The Vision of Unity,* pp. 9, 10. Longmans, Green and Company.

faith and life in Christ. Unity means a oneness in the essential things so real that we shall dare to differ freely in lesser matters, as men and women do who live in real fellowship, without their differences causing, or even suggesting, separation and division. We do not need separated and rival sects to give room for proper freedom. If complete agreement in matters of faith were a prerequisite for unity we might indeed despair, but unity imposes no such condition. While it is obvious that those who are to live and work together in Christ must have a common faith in Him, it is certain that unity cannot be based only on agreement upon questions of doctrine. We need to recognize more clearly that it is not so much agreement which produces unity as it is unity and fellowship which produce agreement. It is the Spirit which maketh men to be of one mind in an house. Our Lord Himself acted upon this principle. He based the unity of His followers on a foundation far deeper than mere intellectual agreement. He did not formulate a creed. He founded a Household, a Church, in which all were to become sharers of His life. It was the living of their common life in Him which was to keep them in the unity of the common faith. It was in the fellowship of the one household that they were to grow together in knowledge of the truth. Right apprehension of truth is important, and necessary. But unity lies more fundamentally in our sharing the life that is in

Christ than in our apprehension, or explanation, of it. And this fundamental unity of life given, and shared, is already ours. What is needed is that this shall be realized and made manifest.

While it is true that the difficulties to be overcome are beyond estimate, the present outlook for unity is full of encouragement. Within the past few decades an astonishing change has taken place. A short time ago few Christians were seriously concerned about unity. Now the desire for it is manifested in all parts of the Church, and in every quarter of the world. A new spirit of fellowship is showing itself. Prejudices are breaking down. Misconceptions are being removed. Mutual respect is taking the place of suspicion and misunderstanding. Scholarship is at work and under its impartial searchlight some of the old difficulties wear a changed aspect. There is a new freedom, a new interchange of thought, a new readiness to compare ideas, and to consider opposing views, among scholars and leaders, in all Communions. Roman Catholics and Protestants, Anglicans and Nonconformists are found sympathetically and open-mindedly studying each other's religious life and teaching. The old, bitter style of controversy has almost disappeared. Of this changed situation, as it appears in England, Canon Goudge says, "If any member of our own body preached about Nonconformists in the style of Dr. South, or wrote about them in the style of the

poet Crabbe, we should soon make him understand how deeply we were shocked by his words. It is rare indeed to hear from one of our own pulpits an unkind word about those separated from us, and we may hope that the same is widely true of Nonconformist pulpits. Moreover, the old aloofness is giving way. We ourselves no longer affect to regard Nonconformity as negligible, either at home or abroad; the work done by Nonconformists for our common Master is far too great and too successful for that. There is much personal friendliness especially among the ministers of the different Communions, much mutual appreciation, a far greater humility and desire to learn one from another." [1]

Christians to-day are realizing that the things which unite them are greater than the things which separate them. They are asking why the separations should continue. This spirit is especially strong among the younger people who will soon be the leaders in the various Communions. From the Student Christian Movement of England comes this declaration: "We feel that the divisions of the church in our country are no longer tolerable, because they obscure that unity in Christ which we know to be more real than our differences. We ask for instant and courageous action. We want to serve a church which stands as one in fearless love of truth." And this utterance is

[1] *The Catholic Party and the Nonconformists*, p. 4.

not exceptional. It is typical of the new spirit and attitude. This spirit was already at work before the war. But the experiences of the war have greatly accentuated and strengthened it. The war brought about on an unprecedented scale, contact between Chaplains of all kinds and men of all faiths. The comradeship in a great cause, the fellowship in a world emergency, revealed them to each other as brothers in spirit, whatever their religious names. They saw that true Christian character, was the product not of any one of the different Religious Communions, but of all of them. And if they were disposed to regard this as the acid test, there is the highest of all authority for such a judgment. "By their fruits ye shall know them." An Army Chaplain of the Church of England writes, "Remove a man from the aura of femininity which surrounded his ministry; compel him to think in a secular medium; pitch him into a world where rations have an inordinate value; compel him to become independent of externals in the spiritual life; surround him with pals who want no phrases but the naked truth; give him God the Spirit for his Teacher, and the Gospel for his tool; and it is not surprising if in these surroundings his style changes, his needs simplify, he develops new affinities, and jettisons a certain amount of lumber out of his theological valise." . . . "It is one thing to accept the presence of the Roman Chapel in your parish as part of your normal

experience; and another to see the soldiers of an Irish regiment laboriously erecting two wooden altars in the camp, at a safe distance from one another, lest the Church of Rome should suffer contagion from the Church of England. It is one thing to acquiesce in the lack of sacramental fellowship with the Nonconformist minister over the way, between whom and you there is a series of border raids and minor sheep-stealing operations; and another thing when you know him as a friend — when you have shared your experience of Christ with him, and worked by his side in the presence of wounds and death." [1]

Some of the approaches to unity at "the Front" may have been such as trained theologians could not approve. But we may remember that the forward rushes of the "inexperienced" American troops, though disapproved, no doubt rightly, by the military experts, helped greatly to shorten the war.

Out of all this fellowship in a common crisis has come an increased sense, if not of the sinfulness, at any rate of the needlessness and futility of the divisions among Christians. The soldier at least sees the folly of trying to fight the Devil with divided forces. Those who have passed through these experiences will be less than ever content with a divided Christianity. Great as was the crime of its originators, the war

[1] The Rev. T. Guy Rogers, Essay on "Reunion and the War" in *Towards Reunion,* Macmillan and Co.

has made powerfully for the unity of the world. It has also worked mightily towards the unity of the Church.

Looking at the Christian world as a whole, we see most important developments in process, and conspicious among them is the changed situation of the ancient Churches of the East. These great Churches, which in our western provincialism we have too little considered, are now coming into a new relation of fellowship with the world, and with the Church at large. For centuries content to live apart, with little desire for contact with the rest of Christendom, they are now stirred with a new spirit and are manifesting a strong desire for unity. Speaking to us from the home and cradle of our religion, out of a Christian life which antedates that of any of the Churches of the West, these Eastern Christians have a great part to play in the life of the United Church, and in the work of bringing together its sundered portions. Their unquestioned antiquity, their steadfastness in the Faith, which none dispute, their experiences of suffering and martyrdom, their deep insight into spiritual truth, all give unique value to the testimony which they bring to us. They have a special witness to bear as to the essentials of an evangelical, historic, catholic, Christianity. Even out of the present chaos in Russia the message comes that the Church of that land is finding new life in the day of her visitation. Bishop

Bury, who has just been among us, and whose work as Bishop of the Anglican Churches in Central and Northern Europe has given him unusual opportunities for knowledge of the situation, predicts that the Russian Church will come out of her fierce ordeal purified, spiritually strengthened, and with new names added to the roll of her martyrs and confessors. One of the most trusted religious leaders of our own land, and of Protestant Christianity the world over, a layman, whose position of leadership has kept him in close relation with Russian affairs, makes the statement that "the Russian Orthodox Church is the one institution in Russia out of which the cement has not fallen." "It should," he says, "be the work of Protestants not to plant their own communions there, but in any way possible to aid the Russian Church to do its work. It will be the great power in the recovery and restoration of the Russian people." The emergence of the Eastern portion of Christendom into the affairs of the Christian world is already showing its effects in practical ways. It is compelling people to see the problem of unity in its true perspective. It is obliging all to recognize that Christians cannot be classified simply as Roman Catholics on the one hand or Protestants on the other. It is making plain to the wayfaring man the fact that the title Catholic cannot, with fidelity to history, or to fact, be claimed as the exclusive property of those in communion with

the see of Rome. In this great Communion of the East, with its hundred and fifty millions of Christians, we see a Christianity which has lived largely apart from our controversies, which is deeply Evangelical, but not Protestant, which is undeniably Catholic, but in no sense Roman, which is as clear and emphatic in its rejection of the claims of the Papacy as it is in its witness to the Catholic Faith. The relations between the Eastern and Anglican Churches have long been most friendly in character. There is indeed nothing which need hold them apart. Their relations have been still further strengthened by recent events, and the time seems now to have come for full inter-communion and fellowship between these Communions.

The deputation representing the World Conference Commission of the Episcopal Church which visited the Churches of the East in 1919 declares, in its report, that these Churches now seem ready for definite steps towards unity. This report says, "A desire for contact with Western Christianity is beginning to find frequent expression throughout the East. Their theological students are being encouraged to go to England and America for part of their education. An interchange of lectureships on Church history and doctrine is being seriously considered in many places. Many progressive reforms are being inaugurated wherein contact with the more active form of western Church life will exercise a stimulating influence. A fresh

missionary determination is overtaking the Eastern Churches as they look forward to such an era of political peace and religious freedom as they have not enjoyed for centuries. It is along such lines as these that the pragmatic West can help the more conservative East. In many particulars it can be truly said that the West lacks what the East has, and the East lacks what the West has. Only in union can the fulness of truth and beauty be found."

At present the chief barrier to progress in the direction of world wide unity is the position taken by the Roman Catholic Church. The official position of this Communion in regard to unity seems still to be that which, years ago, in connection with a famous discussion, a representative organ declared it to be "The Church apostolic, undivided, and universal stands alone among all other religious communities, with everything to bestow, nothing to receive; her call whether to individuals or communities, is a summons not to treat, but to surrender. She sits as judge in her own controversy, the only plea she admits is a *confiteor,* the only prayer she listens to a *miserere.*"

We may have confidence, however, that this will not always be the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church. A far different spirit is found in the utterances of many of her wise pontiffs, in the lives of her great saints, and in the negotiations in which she has at times engaged with those not of her own fold. Her

system is in fact far more flexible than it appears to be, and she has shown remarkable power of adaptation to changed conditions. The growth of a world wide spirit of fellowship, and Christian democracy, will affect Rome as it is affecting all of us. Some new Hildebrand will come to the Papacy who will see the vision of unity as St. Paul did, and will find the true spiritual power of his high office by voluntarily laying aside whatever hinders the Roman Communion from Catholic fellowship with the Church of Christ as a whole. As to the possibility of approach between the Roman Catholic Church and those Communions which seem furthest removed from her, no less interesting a witness than Professor Harnack says, "If one objects to it that at this time no one can imagine how and under what forms Catholicism and Protestantism can ever draw near one another, it is to be remembered that three hundred years ago no one could have conceived beforehand how Lutheranism and Calvinism could have been fused together. And yet we have today, the Evangelical Union, and thousands know themselves as Evangelical Christians without any suspicion of that opposition which once bade Lutherans and Calvinists contend more bitterly than Lutherans and Catholics." [1] It should go without saying, in this day, that no countenance should be given to the old

[1] See quotation in *Passing Protestantism* by Newman Smyth, p. 193.

bitterness against Rome, and that no right-minded Christian can desire anything but what is best for this great Communion, and for her work among men. We must all recognize the spiritual excellences of the Roman Catholic Church; her fearless witness to the supernatural and sacramental truth of the Christian religion; her power to produce saints and spiritual heroes; her appeal to the poetic, and the æsthetic, in the human soul; the devotion with which she reaches and ministers to all classes of men, the unlettered as well as the learned. We see, and we rejoice to see, the zeal and loyalty which she arouses in her people; their living faith and readiness to make sacrifices for their religion; their recognition of the binding duty of worship; the sacredness in which they hold the marriage bond. All this, and more, we see and we thank God for it. These spiritual fruits are a strength to the whole Church of Christ, and, in spite of our divisions, they are the common possession of all of us, for "whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it." [1]

But we shall not make progress towards unity by ignoring, or glossing over, real difficulties. As Christians, we owe it to ourselves, to each other, and to Christ Our Lord, to bear clear witness to the truth as we have learned it in Him, and unity reached by any

[1] I Corinthians xii, 26.

other method than this could result only in disappointment.

There are elements in the Roman Catholic system to which the rest of Christendom can never assent. The present claims of the Papacy cannot be reconciled either with the history, or with the spirit, of the Christian Religion. Unity will not come by way of submission, or absorption of others into any one of the existing Communions. It will come by concord, not by conquest; by mutual and equal fellowship, not by "unconditional surrender." Properly constituted authority there must of course be in the Church, but the day of autocracy has gone, whether in temporal or spiritual affairs, and its spirit is foreign to Christ's Religion. It is, in fact, Christianity itself which by its Gospel of liberty and human brotherhood has destroyed this principle of government. The Papacy, and also the monarchical idea of the Episcopate in so far as this has obtained in the Anglican Communion, or elsewhere, must be modified and brought into full accord with that spirit of freedom and brotherhood which is alone reconcilable with the Gospel, and which the Gospel has itself produced.

Not only will the way to unity be opened, but all the excellences which the Roman Catholic Church possesses will be strengthened, her spiritual power will be incalculably increased, when she relieves herself of her present encumbrances. We must believe that,

in time, this change will take place. Already the demand is heard within the Roman Church for "a constitutionalized Papacy." For the present it is repressed, but it will be heard again, and in time it will prevail. The laity of this Communion will exercise larger power, and the influence within it of the Roman Catholic Church of the United States seems certain to increase. No one can say what form the constitution of the United Church will take. Who shall say that there may not prove to be in it a place for "a constitutionalized Papacy"? This is by no means beyond the limits of possibility, and it is a thought which is already finding expression. With a largeness of view which all of us may well emulate the Free Church authors of *Pathways to Christian Unity* say "somehow the Church has to solve the question which is also plaguing the political world: how to combine central authority with local freedom and representation with true leadership. That leads us to make the daring suggestion that the whole Church needs to embrace in one comprehensive system the different types of Church Government which have been historically developed: Papacy, Episcopacy, Presbyterianism and Congregationalism. This might be found to be other than a wild dream if it was recognized that here was really a place for honorable compromise, which could be secured by the delimitation of authority, by agreement as to what things ought to be bound and what

ought to be left free, and especially by discovering the real nature of Christian authority to consist in the persuasion of love, and to rest upon the enthusiasm of loyalty, instead of borrowing the notions of coercion and the oath of absolute obedience upon which the secular State and military discipline rely. Indeed this may prove to be something much better than compromise — a real experiment in combining principles hitherto supposed to be contradictory. Episcopacy, for instance, which the Free Churches are sometimes asked to swallow as a comparatively harmless concession to Catholic prejudice, or a prudent insurance against possible, but unproved, defects in their ministry, might come to be accepted with genuine enthusiasm if it were rightly presented as signifying the mystical Communion with the Church of the past, which is the Church now triumphant in heaven; as conveying recognition by the whole Church now militant on earth; as a valuable means of maintaining personal fellowship between the local and the central officers of the Church. This, however, would require an Episcopate not only in the historic succession and in unbroken Communion, but also democratically elected and truly representative." [1]

Among the Protestant Communions in all parts of the world the desire for unity is expressing itself with increasing force. The differences between the Prot-

[1] Pp. 193, 194.

estant Churches have, in fact, in large measure ceased to exist. The burning questions upon which the separations took place have many of them burned themselves out. The differences which remain are most of them as to matters acknowledged not to be vital to the Christian Faith. The divisions have outlived their causes, and it is felt widely that there is not sufficient reason for their continuance. The impulse towards closer fellowship among the Protestant Communions has been much strengthened by great interdenominational agencies and movements such as the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., and the Student Christian Movement.

In this country the "Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America," which includes representatives of thirty different denominations, is doing much to draw these Communions nearer to each other, to unite them in combined action and expression so far as this is possible, and to promote among them the spirit of Christian fellowship. While "Federation" does not in itself accomplish unity, and cannot be accepted as a substitute for it, the contact and coöperation which it brings about tend strongly in this direction.

The movement towards unity in the Protestant world is, however, going far beyond desires or tendencies. In a number of cases definite steps have been

taken, bodies closely akin to each other have become united, and others are preparing for like action.

The three most important Lutheran Churches in the United States, heretofore sharply divided, have come together as the United Lutheran Church of America.

Hopeful negotiations are in progress between the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church in that country. The Congregational, Methodist, and Presbyterian Churches in Canada are considering the possibility of uniting and the same Churches in Australia are making similar efforts. In England a movement is under way to bring together the Free Churches under the title of "The United Free Church of England."

In May, 1918, most important action was taken by the General Assembly of the "Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." An invitation was extended to the Evangelical Communions of this country to participate in a meeting "for the purpose of formulating a plan of organic union," and, in December of that year, a preliminary "Interchurch Conference on Organic Union" was held. At this meeting an Ad Interim Committee was appointed with instructions to invite the Evangelical Communions of the United States to send representatives to an "Interdenominational Council on Organic Union." In February, 1920, a meeting of the proposed Council

assembled, with representatives of eighteen Communions attending. A plan of organic union was adopted which is to be submitted to the governing bodies of the several Communions, and when six of them have signified their assent the Council will convene and the plan will go into effect. The plan adopted provides that each Communion shall have "autonomy in purely denominational affairs" reserving the right to retain its credal statements, its form of government in the conduct of its own work, and its particular mode of worship, but the Communions unite in a common declaration of faith, and the Council is to "harmonize and unify the work of the United Churches" and to bring about, so far as may be possible, consolidation of their religious work both at home and abroad. This is the most important and promising action yet taken toward uniting the Protestant Communions. The plan contains the significant statement that "in taking this step, we look forward with confident hope to that complete unity toward which we believe the Spirit of God is leading us." In connection with this movement full consolidation has been effected between the Welsh Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and plans are now in hand which there is good reason to hope will bring into union shortly the United Presbyteries, the Reformed Church, the Presbyterian Church South and

the Presbyterian Church North. The fear is sometimes expressed that such unions of kindred Churches may tend to strengthen them in their present position and so prove a hindrance instead of an advance towards the full realization of unity. There seems, however, to be little ground for this fear. The fact seems to be that fellowship begets the desire for still further fellowship, and that every local movement, every effort to bring together related groups of Churches, gives added momentum to the movement for unity and hastens the day when our Lord's prayer shall find its full answer. More and more as these consolidations take place the spirit of unity will grow, the conviction will increase that unity is possible, it will be felt that we cannot stop short on the road, that the way must be found to bring together all who are in Christ in the visible fellowship of his Church.

In China the "Nanking Church Council" has been formed including in its membership six Communions, with a central executive committee, in order to avoid overlapping and rivalry. From India the report comes that important proposals have been formulated for corporate reunion between the Anglican Church in India, the Mar Thoma Syrian Christians, and the South India United Church, which includes Presbyterians and Congregationalists of both English and American missions. This proposal is of the deepest interest, undertaking as it does to bring into fellow-

ship representatives of the Anglican Church, the Free Protestant Churches and the Eastern Church. It is the unbroken tradition of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church that it was founded by the Apostle Saint Thomas in the year of our Lord 52. This proposal is based on the Lambeth Quadrilateral, including acceptance of "the historic Episcopate, locally adapted."

While no church has done all that it should have done for the sake of unity there has been in the Anglican Communion a deep desire and longing for it ever since the divisions took place. Many are the scholars and saintly leaders of her fold who have given their prayers and labors in its behalf. Names come to mind at once like those of Andrewes, Hooker, Taylor, John Hales, Neale, Muhlenberg, Pusey, and, in more recent time, John Wordsworth, William P. DuBose, W. J. Birkbeck and W. R. Huntington. Although she has fallen short, like others, and at times her course has not been consistent with this, it may be said with justice of the Anglican Church that the longing for unity is one of the deepest notes of her life. Misunderstood often, and, not unnaturally, from opposite sides, she has held steadfastly the difficult middle position in which she was put, and has persisted in the hope that she might be allowed to serve in the work of reconciliation. Of earlier efforts and movements this is not the place to speak. We are considering here the present outlook for unity and,

in this connection, the declaration by the Anglican Church known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral holds epoch-making place.

This pronouncement, which originated in the American Episcopal Church, was issued first by the House of Bishops at the General Convention, in Chicago, in 1886, and was adopted, with slight modifications, by the Lambeth Conference in 1888. In 1899 Dr. William R. Huntington, from whom came the first suggestion of the Quadrilateral, wrote of it, "Whether that eirenicon be indeed the vain shadow which some have been hasty to pronounce it, men can better judge after its terms shall have been honestly lived up to in the house of its friends. Fifty years will be a short time for the test." Only about twenty years have passed since those words were written but the value of this Declaration has been abundantly proved. Its results are to-day plainly evident. At this time movements towards unity based on the Lambeth Quadrilateral are under consideration in India, in Africa, in Australia, in England and in the United States.

At the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church held in Cincinnati, in 1910, a movement was inaugurated to bring about a World Conference on Faith and Order to be participated in by all Christian Communions, throughout the world both Catholic and Protestant which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. In spite of the great diffi-

culties arising from the war the work of preparation for this gathering has steadily proceeded. Almost all the great Communions of the world, including the Eastern and Anglican Churches have identified themselves with the movement and the assembling of the Conference at no distant day, seems now to be an assured fact. An important preliminary Conference for the furtherance of this undertaking is shortly to be held at Geneva. In England the preparatory work for the World Conference has brought forth two remarkable Interim Reports signed jointly by leading representatives of the Free Churches and of the Church of England. The second of these reports, which marks notable advance in the movement towards unity, contains the following statement:

"It is the purpose of our Lord that believers in Him should be one visible society, and this unity is essential to the purpose of Christ for His Church and for its effective witness and work in the world. The conflict among Christian nations has brought home to us with a greater poignancy the disastrous results of the divisions which prevail among Christians, inasmuch as they have hindered that growth of mutual understanding which it should be the function of the Church to foster, and because a Church which is itself divided cannot speak effectively to a divided world."

"The visible unity of believers which answers to

our Lord's purpose must have its source and sanction, not in any human arrangements, but in the will of the One Father, manifested in the Son, and effected through the operation of the Spirit; and it must express and maintain the fellowship of His people with one another in Him. Thus the visible unity of the Body of Christ is not adequately expressed in the coöperation of the Christian Churches for moral influence and social service, though such coöperation might with great advantage be carried much further than it is at present; it could only be fully realized through community of worship, faith, and order, including common participation in the Lord's Supper. This would be quite compatible with a rich diversity in life and worship."

A few years ago no such words as these could have been jointly written, and put forth, by leading theologians of the Church of England and of the Non-Conformist Churches.

Whatever the visible results of the proposed World Conference may be, or even if through some now unforeseen difficulties it should fail to meet, the effort to bring it about has been of incalculable value. The preparation for it has been perhaps as important as the Conference itself. This work carried on during a period of ten years has been a world wide campaign in the cause of Unity. It has kept the thought of unity before the minds of Christians everywhere.

GEORGE MARK ELLIOTT LIBRARY

It has emphasized the fact that the United Church must include all the vital truth for which both Protestantism and Catholicism stand. It has held in view the fact that the only basis possible for unity among Christians is belief in Our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour.

It has helped to make clear to all the fact that unity is to be reached, not by cutting away, but by building up, not by disregard of truth, but by fuller apprehension of it. It has stood for the fact that every group of Christians holds truth which it has received from God, and has its special contribution to make, which is needed in the full life of the visible Church. It has promoted in all directions that human fellowship and personal contact which is so important a factor in reaching mutual understanding. It has helped to create the atmosphere in which alone unity can come to pass. Above all else it has increased the number of Christians, of all names, who are praying in union with Our Lord's own prayer "that they all may be one." In his Bedell Lectures on "A National Church," in 1898, Dr. Huntington wrote, "It is certainly among things conceivable — who shall say that it is not? — that God in His providence may be preparing the way for a General Council of Christendom that shall be truly such." It is this which is the aim of the World Conference. And surely it is cause for thankfulness that such a gather-

ing can now be seriously contemplated; that we have reached the time when it seems possible to hold that "gracious interview of friends so long divided" for which good John Hales prayed three hundred years ago; that after centuries of estrangement Christians are now preparing to meet together not for controversy but for conference; not to see how much they differ, but to see how much they are at one; to face the differences honestly, but in the spirit of love and brotherhood, with the desire, and prayer, that Our Lord's will for the visible unity of His Church may be fulfilled. It is hoped that the Roman Catholic Church may yet find it possible, in some way to participate. If it shall be God's will for this great Conference to assemble, representing all, or almost all, the Christian Communions of the world, who shall say what may be possible in such a gathering, who shall estimate its effect upon the imaginations and the hearts of men, who shall measure its moral and spiritual power, or predict what the results following from it may be?

At the last General Convention, held in Detroit, in 1919, a Proposal was presented providing for approach towards unity between the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Congregational Church, and a Commission was appointed to confer officially upon this subject with a like Commission appointed by the National Council of Congregational Churches. This proposal which has come to be known as the "Con-

cordat," was the result of informal conferences previously held between representatives of the Congregational and Protestant Episcopal Churches. It suggests a mutual agreement and arrangement under which, without casting doubt or reflection upon the reality or efficacy of their present ministry, Congregational ministers may apply for ordination to the office of the Priesthood by a Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It is agreed that a minister thus applying for ordination must do so with the consent of his own ecclesiastical authorities and of his congregation, that he shall satisfy the Bishop that he holds the historic faith of the Church, as contained in the Apostles and Nicene Creeds, that he shall then be confirmed, that he shall be ordained Deacon and Priest, and that thereafter in ministering the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper he shall use a prescribed form which, while it shall be the minimum, shall include all that can be rightly regarded as essential. The minister thus ordained is then to continue his ministrations in his own religious organization but is to remain under the guidance and discipline of the Bishop and is to meet the Bishop, at such times as may be arranged, " for Communion, and for counsel and coöperation."

This proposal is recognized by both sides to be imperfect, and only an interim measure. It is not looked upon as an arrangement which could be permanently

satisfactory. It is not a comprehensive scheme of unity but is suggested only as "a practical approach toward eventual union by the establishment of intercommunion in particular instances." If carried into effect, however, it may prove to be an important step in the direction of reunion. Whether the results arrived at by the further official conferences, now taking place, will receive the approval of the governing bodies of the two Communions, remains to be seen. However this may be all must recognize, and pay honor to, the nobility of purpose, the breadth of mind, and the truly Christian spirit shown by the eminent Congregationalists who, at no small risk of misunderstanding on the part of some of their own brethren, have indicated their readiness, under carefully prescribed conditions, to receive Episcopal ordination to the priesthood, and to make such great concessions for the sake of unity. Such a spirit shown by leading ministers of a great Protestant Communion is an example, and a challenge to all of us. It gives new hope and promise to the outlook for unity. And this is only one of a number of definite proposals now under consideration in various parts of the world for approach towards unity on the basis of the Chicago Lambeth Quadrilateral.

The plan suggested by the Bishop of London for approach between the Church of England and the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and that suggested by

the Bishop of Zanzibar as a basis for the union of the Churches in East Africa are, in principle, the same as the proposed Concordat between the Congregational and Episcopal Churches in the United States. There are some who see danger in these efforts towards unity, and no doubt there are risks involved in them. But there are risks also in our present situation. There is grave danger to the Faith of Christ in the continuance of our present divisions. It is these which are paralyzing the Church and producing apostasy and unbelief among men. But, whatever the attitude of individuals, or particular Communions, towards it, the approach towards unity is taking place. We can be in no doubt as to this. The signs of it are unmistakable. God the Spirit is moving over the chaos of our divisions. On all sides, and in quarters where this might least have been expected, men are seeing the vision of fellowship and brotherhood. If we will, we may have our part in bringing it to pass. But whether we do our part, or not, its coming will not tarry. For the vision is from Christ Himself. And because it is from Him, it will be fulfilled.

III

THE APPROACH TO UNITY

THE call to unity is clear. The outlook for it is more hopeful than at any time since the visible unity of the Church was lost. In many directions movement towards reunion is taking place. But there are incalculable difficulties yet to be met and overcome. There are still those who believe that divisions among Christians are to be acquiesced in as unavoidable; there are those who hold that we cannot have freedom in the Church without sectarianism, and there are those who believe in unity, but are opposed to any measures which might help to bring it into effect. And the great divide between Protestantism and Catholicism is yet to be crossed. How are we to continue the present advance? What are the next steps to be taken? What are the principles which must guide us in our further progress? The first requisite for further advance towards unity is that the desire for it shall be far more keenly felt among Christian people generally. It is not enough for this desire to be felt by the leaders. The unity of the Church cannot be accomplished by arrangement among Bishops, Moder-

ators and General Secretaries. If the leaders of the various Communions should to-morrow reach agreement this would be ineffective if it had not behind it the conscience and conviction of the great mass of Christian people. The leaders cannot, in fact, move far in advance of those whom they are to lead in this matter. Until there is a sincere and general desire for unity schemes for its promotion will meet with only limited success. Our great effort must be to propagate the desire for unity. The war has taught us the power of propaganda both for good and for evil. We need now a wisely and vigorously conducted propaganda for the peace and unity of the Church. The longing for unity must be aroused until, wherever Christians assemble, prayer for its restoration will be offered up. If Christians everywhere, at their Masses and at their Prayer Meetings, wherever they assemble in Christ's Name, were earnestly praying for unity, the day of its coming would not be long deferred. Only through prayer can we find grace so to surrender our wills that the Holy Spirit of Unity can accomplish His work in and through us. It should now be the constant prayer of all of us, both in public and in private, that God will put into our hearts the spirit of fellowship, that He will show us clearly what is His will, and that He will give His guidance especially to those placed in positions of responsibility and leadership.

But if we are intelligently to desire, and pray for, unity we must have clearly before us what its meaning is, and what it involves. There is great need today for clear thinking about unity. People of a practical, business-like, type of mind often ask, somewhat impatiently, why there should be all this talk about unity. If we want unity all that we have to do, according to their view, is to forget our differences, and get together, and the thing is done. This attitude, strongly as it may commend itself to the man in the street, or the man on the train, does not, however, argue deep thought, or close acquaintance with the problem. It is usually the position of those to whom all questions of Christian doctrine seem equally meaningless and unimportant. We are to agree on everything in general because no one longer believes anything in particular. But this is not the path by which Christian unity is to be reached. In the first place we must not dismiss "talk" as a thing wholly without value in this, or in any other cause. How would the progress thus far made towards unity have been accomplished without "talk"? Those who are called to the work of the Ministry should, it would seem, be the last to undervalue this instrumentality. Much reason as there may be for the Scriptural reference to "the foolishness of preaching" the Gospel has nevertheless been propagated by human speech.

What we need is far more talk, of the right kind,

if the cause of unity is to be advanced. And, further, it must be recognized that the problem of unity involves the deepest and most sacred convictions of men's souls. These are not to be waved aside by an impatient gesture. The wounds of a thousand years cannot be healed over night. We shall not make true approach towards unity by ignoring or slurring over the difficulties. It is quite true that we must not dwell unnecessarily on these, and that we must emphasize our agreements. But there are differences which are deep and real, which are felt by earnest Christians to be vital, and which must be honestly faced and dealt with. If in some way, unity could be brought about without facing these difficulties it would be unreal, and would have neither power nor permanence. One of the chief obstacles to progress has been the fear that the advocates of unity were going to sacrifice, or compromise, principles. We must make it clear that this is not what is desired or purposed. It is for this reason that thought about unity must not be confined to conferences of leaders, but must be much more general among Christian people. We may be quite sure, as Bishop Hall says, that the cause of unity is to be promoted "by hearty loyalty to actual and present obligations, not by self-willed eccentricity." "If we are failing in known or plain duties, neglecting privileges, and despising discipline, how can we expect to win others to an

ordered and united Christian life?" [1] We must set ourselves earnestly and intelligently to understand our own position as Christians, whatever this may be. We must ask if there is real justification for the continued separation of our respective Communions, from the rest of the Christian Church and, if so, what this is.

The only thing which can justify any of us in continued separation is that we are holding for others, as well as for ourselves, some truth, or principle, essential to the Gospel, and to the life of the United Church, which would be lost or jeopardized, if we should at once unite with other Christians. But we must be sure that this principle which we are holding in trust is an essential one, and that our present entering into union with others would actually involve its loss or compromise. We must discriminate between our principles and our preferences, or our prejudices. And we know how easy it is for the best, and wisest, of us to confuse the one of these with the other. Differences there are which are matters of principle, but we must not rest helpless even before these. We must ask if these opposing principles are actually irreconcilable. We must ask whether these apparently contrary positions may not after all both of them be essential, and whether there is not some still higher truth in the light of which they can be reconciled. It

[1] Lenten Pastoral, 1911.

is this irenic task to which Christian scholars and theologians of all names are now called.

We must not only understand our own position as Christians, and the reasons, if there are any, for our continued separation, we must get clearly before our minds what the unity of the Christian Church means. If there is still doubt, or misgiving, or apathy in regard to Christian unity, this arises largely from lack of a true conception of it. Our need now is not so much impassioned appeals for unity, as clear expositions of its meaning.

There is among all Christians a true inward unity of the Spirit. Baptized into Christ, and joined to Him by faith, we are members one of another as we are sharers of His life. We are all members of the Church which is His Body. This is the fundamental fact. It is this fact of our actual, existing, oneness in Christ which gives possibility, and hope, of unity in its full realization, and it is this which makes our divisions so unnatural. It is the fact of our brotherhood which makes schism a sin. We cannot emphasize too strongly the reality of this inner unity of the Spirit which now binds all Christians together. But obviously this inner, invisible, unity alone is not sufficient. It does not fulfill our own ideal of a complete unity. It does not fulfill our Lord's desire for the fellowship of His disciples, as this is declared to us in the New Testament. And it does not give the

needed witness of Christ's power to an unbelieving world. We cannot be satisfied, and the world will not be convinced, by a merely invisible unity. In this world soul must have a body, spirit must have outward manifestation. If our unity of the Spirit were all that it should be it would necessarily express itself in visible fellowship; so long as it fails to do this it is imperfect and incomplete. Manifestly our unity is not what it should be while Christians do not meet together at the Table of the Lord.

It is feared by some, however, that the visible unity of the Church might be too much a matter of mere outward organization. This is a fear to be heeded, and a danger, if it exists, to be sedulously guarded against. A unity of mere external organization would be no unity at all. It would be a body without a soul, lifeless and useless for the work of the Spirit. But there is no reason why organization should be overemphasized in the United Church. The primary object of unity is not the strengthening of organization, but the deepening and enlarging of spiritual life. Its great purpose is that, coming into fellowship with one another, we may come also into fuller fellowship with Christ, and may manifest Him more truly to the world. But our inner unity in Christ must be exhibited in a fellowship which men can see. What is needed is such outward organization, and only such, as will give expression to the inward fact, and make

the Church the effective organ, and witness, of the Living Christ. No mere system of federation can meet this need or can take the place of unity. Unity is the fellowship, in soul and deed, of those who are one. Federation is the joint action of those who are still divided. Coöperation in good works to the utmost possible extent among separated Communions is admirable and most helpful. But, as Christians, we are called not to acquiesce in divisions, we are called to end them. We want not a "gentlemen's agreement" among those who continue in separation but the unity of those who belong to one family, and dwell in one household. The unity which we seek is not something which we can make. It is something which God gives. It is from above, not from below. It is the life of the one Spirit knitting us together in the one Body. Let us remember that we are not called upon to create the unity of the Church. Ours is the humbler task of ceasing to obstruct and obscure it. We are called upon to manifest the unity which already exists. We are called not to create a Church in which Christians may become united, but to restore the broken unity of the Church created by Christ Himself in which we are inwardly and spiritually one. We are called to let the world see the unity which is already ours in Christ.

Unity is necessary for the Church's witness, that

men may see in her the evidence of Christ's continued presence with us.

Unity is necessary for the Church's work, that she may be the effective organ of Christ's power able to act and speak in His Name, and to overcome the evil in the world.

Unity is necessary for the fullness of the Church's message. A divided Church can neither apprehend, nor teach, the full truth of Christ. Denominationalism is necessarily one-sided. It makes for disproportion, narrowness of view, over-emphasis on some elements of truth and neglect of other elements.

Unity is necessary for the fullness of life in the Church. The development of special spiritual types in separated groups is a loss to all. The contact of all types in the one household is needed for interest and stimulus, for mutual education and discipline, for the enrichment and full realization of Christian character. Each group of Christians needs to share the spiritual experience, and the special spiritual gifts of each other group. Only in unity and fellowship can we learn the full meaning of our Christian heritage. Great ranges of new power in Christ will open to all of us in the life of the United Church.

We want unity not only for the sake of strength, or of peace, but for the sake of life, life for ourselves and for others. We want unity not only that our

fellow Christians may bring us spiritual treasures which we have not, but also that we and they together may more truly enter into those which we have. Our lack of communion with each other obstructs and hinders our communion with Christ.

We want unity so that all of us may receive more fully the grace and life that are in Him. We want it in order that Christ Himself may be accepted, that His glory may be revealed, that His Kingdom may be established among men.

If, however, we are to make true approach towards unity, there are certain essential principles by which we must be guided. We must be guided in the first place by the principle of Christian loyalty. In loyalty to Christ we may not, even for the sake of unity, surrender, nor compromise the truth of the Gospel. The Gospel is from above. It is not a human philosophy. It is a message received from God. We must be true to it. We must "keep that which is committed to our trust." In the Church of God, we are not in the position of mere seekers after truth, we are seekers after deeper knowledge of the truth clearly revealed in Christ. Our faith rests not on subjective opinions and impressions, but on the realities of a Divine revelation, on actual, definite, historic facts. Jesus Christ lived, died, rose, ascended and lives still with us in His Church. We cannot change or modify these facts. They happened, or they did

not happen. They are true, or they are not true. And if they are not true our "faith is vain," as St. Paul tells us.[1]

The Christian Religion is what Christ makes it, not what any of us think, or feel, about it. Approach towards unity will be made not by disregard of Christian truth, but by fuller and deeper apprehension of it. As believers in Christ we cannot take the position that creed and doctrine are unimportant. Doctrine is only a definite statement of that which is believed to be true. Truth, which is the voice of God, is not unimportant in religion. A religion only of sentiment or feeling could not satisfy us. Religion must speak to the need of the whole man, mind, heart and spirit. The Christian Religion does so speak. Jesus Christ is "the Life," to be lived, but He is also the Truth to be believed. Religion without doctrine would be religion without a knowledge of Christ. Some quite unessential results of theological speculation have been taught as doctrines. Other doctrines are the soul and substance of the Gospel. It is true that a belief in right doctrine alone is not sufficient. A man may believe all the articles of the Christian Faith and not be in any real sense a Christian. It is quite true that we need to be more simple in our faith. But this does not mean that we can discard doctrine. For a Christian, religion means

[1] I Cor. xv, 14.

personal faith in, and relationship with the living Christ. But if we are to be in relationship with Christ we must know Who He is, what is His present power, how we may have fellowship with Him, and these are all questions of doctrine. The answer to these questions is our creed.

The foundation of approach towards unity is our common belief in Christ as God and Saviour. This is the faith which unites us not only with Christians throughout the world to-day, but with all the Church of the past, which is now the Church in Paradise. This is the only basis upon which it would be possible for Christians to unite. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." No Christian Communion could give up that which it believes to be essential to the revelation received in Christ, nor could it desire any other Communion to do this. In the phrase of the Archbishop of York, as expanded by the Bishop of Bombay, unity will come "not by compromise for the sake of peace, or of success, but by comprehension for the sake of truth, and of life." We do not want "a reduced Christianity." We shall all be richer, not poorer, in faith, in the life of the United Church. The question is not what is each Communion willing to surrender, but what has each Communion to contribute that is true, and vital, and from God.

It is becoming clear to us that our affirmations of

faith are more important than our negations, and it is these which will lead us towards unity. We at last see clearly, and in this lies the great present hope of progress, that each separated group of Christians holds gifts of truth and life which it may not surrender, but which are needed for the life and fullness of the whole Church. We do not wish to see any Communion compromise its convictions, or "disown its past." The United Church will be more than a return to the faith of the first days. The spiritual struggles of these later times have had their meaning also. The United Church will contain all the revelation given in Christ, all the great Catholic heritage of the Church of the first centuries, but it will contain also all the spiritual fruit, all the rich product, of the Christian faith and experience of the generations since, including that which has been developed through the stress, and trial, and discipline of our divisions.

We must be guided by the principle of Christian loyalty, but also, and equally, in our approach towards unity, we must be guided by the principle of Christian liberty. In loyalty to Christ we may not demand, as a condition of unity with our fellow Christians, anything that is not actually essential to Christian faith and life. If we demand acceptance of that which is not essential, if we require that which Christ Himself would not require for fellowship in His Church,

then, whether consciously or unconsciously, we are placing obstacles in the way of His work in this world. We are opposing the will of Christ that His followers may be visibly one; we are making it harder for the world to believe that God has sent Him. It is now time for "each Church to judge for itself, as it would be judged by its Lord, whether it so holds its own position as to prevent any other part of the Church from communion with the whole Church."

Proper freedom for all in the Christian life, opportunity for full spiritual realization and expression, liberty in its highest meaning, in voluntary obedience to God's law, this is itself a principle of the Gospel which must be sacredly guarded. As we approach towards unity we need more reverent thought, clearer knowledge, deeper insight into Christian truth, that we may see it in right proportion, that we may do justice to the views of those who differ from us, that we may distinguish between principles and preferences, between the essential and the non-essential. People imagine too often that by unity is meant uniformity in all sorts of details of faith or worship which are no part of the essence of our religion, but matters only of opinion, taste, or preference. Unity does not mean that we are to be deprived of our lawful Christian liberty in these matters, nor that other Christians are to be deprived of theirs. It does not involve our conforming precisely to their pattern, nor their con-

forming precisely to ours. The Anglican and Free Church signers of the English "Interim Report" say truly that "the visible unity of the Body of Christ is not adequately expressed in the coöperation of the Christian Churches for moral influence and social service," and can "only be fully realized through community of worship, faith, and order, including common participation in the Lord's Supper," but they add with equal truth, "this would be quite compatible with a rich diversity in life and worship."

It would not be inconsistent with unity if the different groups of Christians should continue their present organizations, with entire control of their own affairs, with all their special usages and methods, provided that these usages are in accord with the principles of the common Faith, and recognizing that, in these unessential matters, a like freedom must be allowed to all others. Why should not the various groups so carry on their work for Christ, not as opposed, and separated, Communions, but as mutually helpful, and fully recognized parts of the one great Church? Why should not each group have all the independence which it now has, not only as to administration, and methods of practical work, but as to ritual, as to forms of worship, as to devotional expression, as to emphasis on particular aspects of doctrine or spiritual life, provided only that this shall all be in accord with the accepted common standard as to essentials? Why

should not each group continue to have this freedom, with the still greater freedom added of full, unhindered access to, and fellowship with all other groups? There is no Protestant principle against this. There is certainly no Catholic principle against it. The Catholic rule is "unity in things essential, liberty in things non-essential, charity in all." This is in accord, and nothing less free is in accord, with every principle of Christ's religion.

All Christians could then continue to be identified with the group to which they felt drawn by tradition, association, or temperament, the varied customs, the special spiritual excellences of each would be preserved and continued for the enrichment of the life of the whole Church, but schism would be at an end, extremes would be balanced and tempered, all would feel a new power through their fellowship in the one visible Church. The thing essential for Christian unity is not oneness in details of worship, or in methods of administration, but such fellowship in faith and order as shall make possible full intercommunion without doubt or question in the minds of any. The Bishop of London, in his proposal for unity with the Wesleyan Methodist Church, says "The Methodist Church would continue its class meetings, and its Conferences," it "would retain its Connection, and its order in the reunited Church" and would "go on with its habits and its practices undis-

turbed." In his proposal for unity among the various Communions in East Africa the Bishop of Zanzibar says "Non-Episcopal bodies accepting Episcopacy would remain in full exercise of their own constitutions, working parallel with the present Episcopal churches." It is fellowship at the Table of the Lord which is the essential matter. This is the true realization, the indispensable requisite, the sign and seal of unity. Without this, unity among Christians cannot be truly manifested. The Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are of Divine appointment, and are therefore essential. They were instituted, and commanded to be continued, by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. But the particular form of service to be used when these Sacraments are administered is not essential, except in so far as this is necessary to ensure their ministration in accordance with our Lord's institution of them. This secured, the form of service may be long or short, simple or ornate, liturgical or non-liturgical with equal loyalty to essential principle. The Lambeth Quadrilateral specifies, as to the method of administering these Sacraments, only that they shall be "ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and the elements ordained by Him."

In the administration of Baptism the use of the sign of the Cross is not essential, nor is the provision of Sponsors, nor the method of using the water whether

by immersion or by pouring. In the administration of the Lord's Supper the use of vestments is not essential, nor is the form or arrangement of the Church building, nor the manner in which the congregation receives the Sacrament. In these and all such non-essential matters we must be willing to allow full freedom to all. We must require no more as a condition of fellowship than is actually essential. If we would be Catholic, and Christian, we must be true not only to the principle of loyalty, but also to the principle of liberty. We may feel, and with good reason, the importance and spiritual value of an orderly and beautiful ceremonial of worship. But worship just as real may be offered in the tent of a traveling evangelist as in the noblest cathedral. It is true that the Liturgy comes to us with the authority and weight of most sacred use and association. Those of us who have inherited it, and who know its power could never forego its use. But we should not be justified in requiring this of others. We have no right to insist either that all Christians shall worship with a book, or that all shall worship without one. Eastern Christians are accustomed to pray standing up. There is no reason why they should be compelled to kneel, nor why Anglicans or others, should be prevented from doing so. The dress worn by the minister at Divine service is not an essential matter. The use of special vestments may appear to us highly proper, and may

have many advantages, but it is not a matter of Divine prescription as to which we may demand uniformity. Scholars tells us in fact that special vestments did not come into general use until about the seventh century. Before that time the clergy wore the ordinary dress of the day both in church and out of it. And the use of a distinctive dress by the clergy did not, as some may imagine, originate with Rome. The custom originated in the Eastern and Gallican Churches and was disapproved by Rome. A pope of the fifth century wrote to certain Gallican Bishops who were guilty of these innovations, much as a Presbyterian of the old school might write to-day, "We should be distinguished from the people by our learning, not by our clothes."

The dress of the minister in the service of the Church has its value and importance, as thirteen hundred years of usage may attest, but it is not essential that the sermon should be preached either in a surplice, or in a black gown, and the Holy Communion may be validly celebrated in alb and chasuble, in a military uniform, or in any other garb. The Lambeth Articles say not one word about ritual. The Book of Common Prayer says that "the particular forms of Divine Worship, and the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be used therein" are "things in their own nature indifferent, and alterable, and so acknowledged." This does not mean that we are to have no law as to the form of

worship, or that the members of a particular Communion are not bound by such prescription as to worship and ritual as may be made by their own duly constituted authorities. They are manifestly under obligation to abide by such provisions. It does mean that no existing Communion should wish, or would have the right, to impose its own customs upon other Christians, or to demand conformity in these matters as a condition of fellowship.

There is complete intercommunion and unity between the Episcopal Church in the United States and the Episcopal Church in Australia or Canada or elsewhere, but these Churches are under the direction of no central organization, or authority. Each is entirely independent of the other in its administration, each has in many respects, and is free further to develop, its own customs and usages, in harmony with the common standard of Faith. Their Bishops meet together in conference at Lambeth once in ten years, but attendance at this gathering is voluntary, and the conference possesses no governmental authority or function. It is true that each of these Churches uses the Book of Common Prayer, and this is a strong bond. But this is not essential to their unity. The Episcopal Church in the United States changes, or revises, the Prayer Book as it sees fit, without consultation with its sister Churches, and would be free even

to dispense with the use of this noble book of worship if it should ever wish to do so.

It would be a great step on the way to unity if Christians would now recognize that in non-essential matters there must be liberty in all parts of the Church, with full room for the free working of the Spirit. Why should it be difficult for us to live side by side in the same Church with groups of Christians who in these matters are more primitive, or less primitive, more given to simplicity, or more given to demonstration, than we are ourselves?

The question which the world is now asking is not as to any minor or secondary matter, but as to whether Christianity is from above, as to whether Jesus Christ still lives among us, as to whether there is truth and hope and life eternal in the Gospel. It is this question which must be answered with the full power of a united testimony.

What is needed now is a United Church so faithful to the Gospel, so free, so filled with the spirit of love and fellowship that in it the presence and glory of Christ shall be made manifest.

The third principle which must guide us in our approach towards unity is the principle of ecumenicity. We must have always in mind the ultimate ideal, the only full and sufficient goal, the reunion of the whole Church of Christ throughout all the world.

Nothing lower, or less, than this can satisfy us; for nothing less will fulfill the prayer of Jesus Christ. We must be true, always, to this final purpose. All that we undertake in the cause of unity must be in conformity with this, and must be tested by it. Partial and local movements towards unity are to be encouraged, and promoted, to the fullest possible extent. But we must do nothing, for the sake of local and temporary gain, which conflicts with the ultimate aim, or which would lessen our power to help towards its attainment. We shall not be making progress if, in our efforts to close one breach, we tear others wider open. It is plain, for example, that the Anglican Church would not be serving the cause of reunion if, for the sake of much to be desired closer approach to the Protestant Communions, she were to let go that which she holds in common with the Catholic Communions of both the East and the West. In all Communions we must hold fast to those central principles upon which alone Christians throughout the world can be united. We must keep the full vision of unity before us. But we must not wait for the vision to realize itself. God does not so teach us to do our work for Him.

There are some who are so eager for unity that they seem ready to cast all questions of faith to the winds. A Church so united would have lost the secret of its life and would have no power to help and

save the world. There are others who are so fearful that the Faith may be compromised that they are opposed to action of any sort. Unity, they seem to feel, is to be desired, and prayed for, but nothing is to be done to bring it about. Its accomplishment is to be left wholly to God. Each of these positions is, at bottom, a faithless one. We must pray, but we must act also. If faith without works is dead, prayer without corresponding action is equally so.

The blessing is promised to those who make peace, not to those who wait for peace to come to pass of itself. We must believe and go forward. More than ever before we must recognize that true inner unity which already exists between ourselves and our fellow Christians of every name, Catholic and Protestant. We must recognize more fully that we are all brethren in Christ. We must not only accept but seek opportunities to express this fellowship, publicly and privately, in every way that is possible under existing conditions. This attitude and spirit shown by all of us would carry us far. It would soften our prejudices, enlarge our hearts, widen our outlook, and produce the atmosphere in which the Spirit of Peace can do His holy work.

If, as some feel, there are dangers in too close approach to our fellow Christians, it is certain that there are dangers in remaining apart from them. If a true theology is essential for the full realization of unity,

human fellowship may have much to do with its beginnings. At Camp Upton, where it was my privilege to serve for eleven months, the Chaplains, both Catholic and Protestant, met together each Wednesday morning to discuss plans for their common work. As the opening prayer was offered at those meetings all felt that God the Spirit was with us. No one was asked, or desired, to compromise his convictions. We knew that there were differences of faith among us, but we knew, still more deeply, that we were brethren in Christ, and found that we could both feel and work as such. The surest antidote for religious prejudice is human contact. The Gospel stands unalterably for truth, but its first principle is love. Whether it be called Catholic, or Protestant, there is something wrong with any theology which sees danger in personal contact, or which tends to separate men from their fellows.

We Christians, of all names, must emphasize the fact of our brotherhood. We belong to one another in the bond which joins us to Christ. The things which unite us are indeed greater than the things which divide us. By virtue of our Baptism we are all members of the one Church, which is Christ's Body. It was the great Von Döllinger, in his *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches,* who wrote: —

"As being baptized we are all on either side brothers and sisters, we are all at bottom members of the Universal Church. In this great garden of God let

us shake hands with one another over the confessional hedges, and let us break them down so as to be able to embrace one another altogether."

What we all need is closer fellowship with Christ. This is the path which will lead us to unity. It is unity which is needed to bring us the full blessing and power of our life in Christ, but it is closeness to Christ which is needed, above all else, to bring us to unity. It is lack of holiness in the lives of Christians which is the chief obstacle to the unity of the Church. If all of us were truly converted to Christ the way to unity would speedily be opened. If we are to have Christian unity we must be real Christians. The great effort in all Communions must be to raise the level of faith and life nearer to that which Christ would have it. The Church everywhere must make higher demand upon her people. She must ask higher things spiritually from all of us, clergy and people alike. In conjunction with the call to unity there must go out a call for more simple faith in Christ. It is this which will bring us nearer to each other. We are one in the life that is in Christ, and more deeply than we recognize, we are one also in faith. We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, "God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God." Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, Methodists, Eastern Orthodox, Baptists, Congregationalists, Anglicans, we are all one in this. And the Christian religion is belief

in, and fellowship with, Christ our Lord. Other matters are important, but this is the all important matter. This is the rock on which all our faith rests. From this follows all else that we believe. With this in common it must be possible for us to find the way to full fellowship. We must emphasize, and hold constantly in view, the things in which we are at one. "The Christian Church is one family, and Christians are brothers. It is a fact, not an aspiration. All Christians are brothers." [1] The cry which all of us, Christians of every name, need to hear to-day is "Sirs, ye are brethren."

[1] *Unity and Schism,* by T. A. Lacey, p. 158.

IV

THE CALL TO THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

CHRISTIAN Unity is the greatest of all questions now before the Church, and the world. It goes to the root of human life, and underlies all the other problems with which we have to deal. If Christianity does not bring the spirit of fellowship into the relationships and affairs of men, what other power is there to do this? The call to unity is from Christ Himself, and therefore it comes with compelling force to all Christians, Catholic and Protestant. In our approach towards unity we must be true to the principle of Christian loyalty, and true, equally, to the principle of Christian liberty. Unity will be reached not by the path of elimination but by the path of inclusion; not by disregard of principle or conviction, but by recognition of the whole truth seen, and witnessed to, by opposing sides. The United Church must have place in it for "all that is vital and vitalizing." The only right, and the only possible, line of approach towards unity is that of fullest welcome to whatever is in accord with the principles of the Gospel and is of proved value in Christian life and experience.

In the providence of God, and by His ordering of the events of history, not by choice, or virtue of its own, the Anglican Communion has a unique opportunity to further the advance of unity along this path. The Anglican Church is called now to realize, as never before, how great, how truly God-given is its opportunity to serve the cause of reunion. Anglicanism, we know well, has sins and shortcomings enough to acknowledge and repent. By its coldness, at times when the currents of its spiritual life ran low, it has discouraged enthusiasm, it has failed to sympathize with new movements, it has been responsible, in part, for divisions which might have been avoided. By its too great emphasis on uniformity, its formality and fear of novelty, it has repressed too much the spirit of individual enterprise, and the more emotional side of religious life. By its connection with the State, a connection not begun at the Reformation, but existing through its identification with the English race from its earliest beginnings, the life and work of the Church of England have been in these later days hampered and hindered. All this and more we must acknowledge, but nevertheless the Anglican Communion has had its own great part to play in the life of the Christian Church, and it seems now to have a mission to fulfill for which it has been providentially prepared. The Anglican Church has stood both for the Catholic Faith and for the spirit of progress, for

the principle of authority and the principle of freedom; for the full recognition of both the supernatural and the natural; for the reality of Revelation and for the rights of reason. She has developed the temper of soberness, steadfastness, and wide tolerance. The characteristic notes of her life may be said to be sanity, charity and love of truth. She has shown her power to produce true saints, great leaders in social reform, sons and daughters whose names are among the greatest in history. One of her most distinctive contributions has been her work in the field of scholarship. It was one of her wisest sons, the late Bishop Creighton, who described her as, "the Church of sound learning." So impartial a witness as Mr. Lecky says: "Looking at the Church of England from the intellectual side, it is plain how large a proportion of the best intellect of the country is contented, not only to live within it, but to take an active part in its ministrations. There is hardly a branch of serious English literature in which Anglican clergy are not conspicuous. There is nothing in a false and superstitious creed incompatible with *some* forms of literature (as, for example, poetical genius and beauty of style). But in the Church of England literary achievement is certainly not limited to these forms. In the fields of physical science, in the fields of moral philosophy, metaphysics, social, and even political philosophy, and perhaps still more in the fields of history,

its clergy have won places in the foremost rank . . . marked not only by profound learning, but, to an eminent degree, by judgment, criticism, impartiality, a desire for Truth, a skill in separating the proved from the false, or the merely probable. There is no other Church which has shown itself so capable of attracting and retaining the services of men of general learning, criticism and ability."

Through the long centuries of her life, dating back to the days before there was a united nation in Britain, the influence of the Church of England has been incalculable in producing that type of character which has given the English-speaking peoples their present place in the life of the world, and their great responsibility for its future.

The Anglican Church has never for a moment thought of herself as the whole Church of Christ. Her highest claim has been that, in spite of her many insufficiencies, she is a true part of the Church. She has believed that she was holding certain essential principles to which she must bear faithful witness, as belonging to the fullness of the Gospel, and as necessary to the life of that United Church, the thought of which has been always in her mind. But while steadfastly witnessing to these principles she has based upon them no exclusive claims for herself, and has passed no judgment upon those whose principles differed from her own.

It has long been recognized that the Anglican Church has peculiar opportunity to be a reconciling influence in Christendom. The words of the Roman Catholic layman of France, de Maistre, have been often quoted. "If ever," he said, "and everything invites to it, there should be a movement towards reunion among the Christian bodies it seems likely that the Church of England should be the one to give it impulse. Presbyterianism, as its French nature rendered probable, went to extremes. Between us and those who practice a worship which we think wanting in form and substance there is too wide an interval; we cannot understand one another. But the English Church, which touches us with the one hand, touches with the other those with whom we have no point of contact. She is like one of those chemical re-agents which unite elements incapable, in their own nature, of reunion."

These words point to a truth the full meaning of which is only now becoming clear. We have been disposed to think, somewhat complacently, of the Anglican Church as adhering closely to primitive Faith and Order, and holding the middle ground upon which extremes on either hand would some day have to meet. But it is time for us to realize that unity will never come, and should never come, by any mere path of compromise, and that the mission of the Anglican Communion is one vastly greater, much more difficult,

far more noble than this. Christendom stands divided into two great groups, Catholic and Protestant. What we need now to see, and what Christians are at last beginning to see, is that the central, pivotal principles witnessed to and emphasized by these two great separated groups are not as fundamentally opposed one to another as they have been assumed to be.

We are coming to see that at any rate in their beginnings the divisions among Christians which have lasted for centuries, and which have worked such untold harm to the cause of Christ, were due more to human passion and prejudice, to controversial bitterness, to the intolerant spirit of the time in which they took place, than to any actually irreconcilable differences between the opposed positions.

If this is the fact it throws a most hopeful light along the path towards unity. And study of the questions at issue shows that this is the fact. The divisions have been due in most cases not to essential incompatibility in the different principles, but rather to a kind of intellectual pride which has refused to allow place for any apprehension of the truth but its own, assuming that its own apprehension had taken in the whole of the truth. It is the simple fact that if there had been a reasonable spirit, a temper of conciliation, a desire on both sides to see the truth without prejudice, the divisions between Catholics and Protestants need never have taken place. There was nothing in

the contending principles which necessitated this. It was not that one of these principles was true and that the other was false. Each principle was in essence equally true, and each was needed for the balance and completeness of the other. This cannot of course be said of all the differences in detail, nor of all the issues and questions which have since developed. Division has developed further difference, and separateness has borne its unwholesome fruit. But if it can now be seen, and acknowledged, that there was no real necessity for division in the beginning, that the questions at issue did not require this, that the main principles held by both sides are true and necessary, this at least points the way towards reconciliation, it opens a real door of hope, it establishes a foundation upon which a true unity may be brought about.

What are the fundamental ideas and principles for which the words Catholic and Protestant respectively stood, and for which they still stand? The fundamental question at issue between the Catholic and Protestant positions is not confined to the sphere of religion. It is one which runs through the whole of life. It is the question of the relation of the individual to society as to the whole of which he is a part. It is this question which is at the root of all our human problems, social, political, industrial, economic or philosophic. It is only natural that this question should have its place in the life of the Church. The

word Catholic means literally that which is "according to the whole." It connotes not only the universal but the corporate, that which relates to the wholeness and the oneness of life. Essentially the word Catholic stands for authority, unity, universality, for the social and corporate expression of Christian truth and life, for emphasis on the Divine claims and the Divine side of religion. And this principle for which the word Catholic stands is true, and essential to Christian faith and life. The word Protestant means literally "witnessing." It connotes personal witness to truth, individually experienced. Essentially the word Protestant stands for personal freedom, for individual responsibility, for the direct access of the human soul to God, for the dignity and sacredness of the spirit of man, for emphasis on individual development and on the human side of religion. And this principle for which the word Protestant stands is also true, and essential to Christian faith and life. Not only is each of these great principles true but each is of the very life of the Gospel. Each had its place in the beginning, has its place now, and must have its place forever in the life of the Church. Each is a part of the faith once for all delivered to the saints. St. Paul stood for each of these principles with equal clearness and fullness. He is claimed as confidently, and as rightly, by the champions of the Protestant principle as he is by the champions of the Catholic principle.

Each principle is liable to exaggeration and undue emphasis, and each has indeed often been exaggerated and unduly emphasized. Each principle needs the other to correct and supplement it. Neither principle has in fact been exclusively the possession of either group. All along each group has, in greater or less degree, recognized the truth emphasized by the other.

What we need now in our approach towards unity is not some compromise upon a middle ground between the fundamental principle of Protestantism and the fundamental principle of Catholicism, but full recognition by each group of the truth, the importance, the indispensability of the principle for which the other stands.

It is here that the Anglican Communion has to-day its great opportunity. The position which the Anglican Church holds is not a mere via media, a middle path of compromise cautiously taken to escape extremes. The Anglican Church does not hold some nondescript position midway between the opposed Catholic and Protestant principles. She touches each of these on either hand, as de Maistre expressed it, because she recognizes and finds place for both the Catholic principle and the Protestant principle within her own life. She shows in actual fact that these two principles are not mutually exclusive and contradictory. She is both Catholic and Protestant.

The Anglican Communion includes these two posi-

tions within her fold as no other Communion on earth does. She is the one Communion in the world in which those who represent the Catholic position, and those who represent the Protestant position, now live and work together, in fellowship and unity. It is this which gives her the special mission to which she is called. Her mission is to lead towards unity by showing, still more clearly than she has yet done, that these apparently opposed principles are not incompatible but that each finds larger and fuller life by association with the other. It may be that until we are ready for reunion it is best for each group of Christians to continue its present limiting denominational name, if only as a reminder of its condition of separation and exile from the full life of the Catholic Church. If, however, the Protestant Episcopal Church should wish to change its name the most strictly accurate, the most truly significant and the most historically correct designation for it would be, as Dr. Miel told us, the "Catholic Protestant" or the "Protestant Catholic" Church. The Anglican Church claims no credit for the fact that this is her position. She did not take it of her own wisdom, nor of her own ordering. She has not fully realized its meaning, nor the high mission which it gives her. She has in large degree accepted this position as of necessity, under compulsion, and has regarded it often as a burden grievous to be borne, involving her in

weakness and self-contradiction. Some of her children, on each of the opposing sides, have cried out against it, a few have even fled from her fold in fear of it, or in failure to understand it. But she is now called to see the true meaning of her opportunity and to put it to full use in the cause of unity. We have been in the habit of lamenting the break between the English and the Roman Churches, at the time of the Reformation. Evil, however, as were some of the circumstances, and some of the consequences, of this estrangement between sister Churches we can see, more clearly than our forefathers did, that it was of providential ordering. Like Joseph, banished into Egypt, we can now see the Divine purpose in this, and can say, as he did on his reunion with his brethren, "God meant it unto good." As a result of her life history, and of the experience through which she has passed, the Anglican Church has been prepared for the work of reconciliation, she is able not only to understand but, still more important, to feel, in some measure, the religious value and significance, of the truths emphasized, respectively, by Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Protestant Christianity.

The chief differences of belief which separate Catholics from Protestants are those which relate to the nature of the Church, the Sacraments and the Ministry. These questions are indeed of great moment. None of us could wish that they should be lightly re-

garded, or that their importance should be underestimated. Even for the sake of unity the truth involved in these questions could not be sacrificed. These are not external questions. They touch the very life of the Gospel. The different views are held by the two great sections of Christendom with deepest and most serious conviction. But recognizing the seriousness of the questions, are the differences of belief about them, such as must permanently separate Christians from one another? Are the different views fundamentally opposed, and irreconcilable, or is it true that, in these vital matters each side is contending for something that is indispensable; that each side is in the main right in what it affirms, and wrong chiefly in what it denies; that the way to unity is not by rejection of either belief, but by acceptance and recognition of each as part, and a necessary part, of the higher truth which includes them both? If this is the fact then no doubt the Kingdom of God is not far from us. If we can see that we are not divided by fundamental principle, we may hope that other difficulties, serious though these may be, can in time be overcome.

Catholics and Protestants appear to hold widely differing views as to the Church. But is the difference here so great as appears on the surface? Every Christian, of whatever name, in his heart thinks of the Church as differing from any other organization on earth, as having some supernatural character, as

speaking and witnessing and ministering in the name of God. Every Christian regards the Church as something more than a social club or an educational agency. The Catholic feels and stresses the Divine character of the Church. He stands for the principle of authority, of continuity, of order, for the importance and necessity of corporate faith and life. He emphasizes the fact that fellowship in the Church is necessary to spiritual life and development. The Protestant, on the other hand, feels and stresses the importance and Divine character of the individual soul. He stands for the principle of liberty, of spontaneity, of full individual expression. He stands for the fact that spiritual development is possible only through personal faith and individual experience. But there is nothing in these two principles that is incompatible. So far from being mutually exclusive or destructive they are vitally necessary to each other. Every thoughtful Protestant and every thoughtful Catholic does in fact hold both principles in some degree. All must agree that corporate religion and individual religion are equally necessary, and that only in the corporate life of the Church can the individual Christian find his full life and development. With all their differences all Catholics and almost all Protestants in their fundamental conception of the Church are at one. They believe alike that the Church is Christ's Body and that it includes all who share the

life that is received from Him. They believe alike that the Church is a Divine institution. In the words of an eminent representative of the Congregational Church, "Every Christian, in his soul, be he rationalist or sacramentarian, evangelical or sacerdotalist, Protestant or Catholic, cherishes a supernatural idea of the Church, looks upon it as the Bride of Christ, the supreme object of His love, the Body of Christ, the very incorporation of His Spirit, the Heavenly City, the New Jerusalem, the Communion of Saints." [1] Between those who together hold such a conception of the Church as this surely no impassable gulf is fixed!

In our discussions of Christian Unity it is of the utmost importance to take the questions for consideration in their proper order. If we and our brethren of the Nonconformist Churches should begin by discussing the Ministry and the question of a valid ordination, we should probably halt there indefinitely. One of the chief hindrances to progress has been that this question, important as it is, has been considered out of its due relation to the deeper question of the meaning and nature of the Christian Church. If we find ourselves fundamentally at one in our conception of the Church, we can then approach subsidiary questions with far more hope of agreement. As Canon Goudge well puts it, "We should begin with the

[1] Revd. Raymond Calkins, in *Approaches Towards Church Unity,* by Newman Smyth and Williston Walker, p. 85.

Church, and that brotherhood, one with another, which our common membership bestows. The historical problems as to the origin and character of the Christian ministry are a Serbonian bog, out of which we should keep as long as possible. Let anybody read, in any order which he prefers, Dr. Gore's *The Church and the Ministry,* Dr. Lindsay's *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries,* and Mr. Lowrie's *The Church and its Organization,* to take but three books out of very many, and then endeavor to balance the arguments, and put down the conclusions which have clearly emerged. . . . It is highly important to keep the question of the ministry in its place. Broadly speaking, the Church does not so much depend upon the ministry as the ministry upon the Church. The Church is not the Church because it has a 'valid ministry'; rather the ministry is valid because it is the ministry of the Church." [1]

With regard to the Ministry, the Protestant emphasizes those elements of the office which are distinctive of the prophet, the Catholic emphasizes those elements of the office which are distinctive of the priest. It must be admitted that Catholics have been suspicious of the liberty of prophesying, and that Protestants have been prejudiced against the idea of the priesthood. But why should it be so? Why should either of these ideas of the Ministry be regarded as

[1] *The Catholic Party and the Nonconformists,* p. 10.

denying or excluding the other? Catholic and Protestant, in fact, do recognize, in some measure, the necessity of both priest and prophet. The Christian Religion calls for the exercise of each of these functions of the Ministry. The exercise of each function is demanded by the facts and needs of human life. What we need, and must have, in the Ministry of the Church is not priest *or* prophet, but priest *and* prophet, with full recognition of the place and need of each. Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself is the perfect example of both. It is sometimes said that according to the Catholic theory the minister receives his authority from above, while according to the Protestant theory he receives his authority from below. But this is not a statement which does full justice to the respective positions. The difference of view is not as to whether the authority and power of the minister come from above or from below, but rather as to the means by which these are conveyed and assured and as to how the ministerial commission shall be outwardly authenticated. Whether the prophetic, or the priestly, aspect of the Ministry is emphasized; whether it is held that the power to exercise its functions is conveyed and assured through an outward and visible ministerial succession, or whether it is held that it is given without this outward means and assurance, each side holds equally that both the call to the Ministry,

and the power to exercise it, are from God. Catholic and Protestant alike believe that the Ministry speaks, and ministers, with authority from above. According to each view the primary qualification for the work of the Ministry is the call of God the Spirit, and the power which He alone can bestow. The Protestant, it is true, stresses the fact that the minister exercises his functions as representing, and on behalf of, the people. But a true Catholic doctrine holds firmly the representative character of the priesthood, and teaches that the priest's office exists only by virtue of that priesthood of all believers, of which it is the organ. Dr. R. C. Moberly says: "The Christian Ministry is not a substituted intermediary — still less an atoning mediator — between God and lay people; but it is rather the representative and organ of the whole body, in the exercise of prerogatives and powers which belong to the body as a whole." [1] As Bishop Gore expresses it, quoting, in part, Canon Liddon, "The difference between clergy and laity is not a difference in kind, but in function." [2]

The Catholic emphasizes the necessity of a regular form of appointment and commission to the Ministry, he believes in the principle of continuity and succession as the sign of power given from above and the

[1] *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 242.
[2] *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 84.

means through which this is outwardly assured, and holds that Episcopal ordination is essential for the exercise of the priestly office.

The Protestant emphasizes the necessity of the inward and spiritual gift proved by manifestation of the fruits of the Spirit in life and work and holds that the form by which the Commission is given is not essential. But wide as are the differences between these two positions it is not impossible for them to dwell together in unity. Christians holding these different views can dwell in fellowship in the one household and they do, in fact, so dwell in the Anglican Communion. It is fuller realization of the sacramental truth of the Church itself as the Body of Christ which will bring us to fuller and deeper views of the Church's Ministry.

Strongly, and rightly, as we may believe in the necessity of a regular outward form of appointment to the Ministry, and in the principle of ministerial succession, we must all of us be willing to leave place for the free working of the Spirit of God. Recognizing to the full that God works in His Church, as elsewhere, normally according to a regular order, we must also recognize, with equal fullness, that God has power to work outside His established order. And in this matter of the Ministry we must recognize that God has, in fact, chosen so to work. We must acknowledge, and rejoice in, the presence and power

of the Spirit wherever, and by whatever means, it may be manifested. That it is necessary for those called to the Ministry to receive the power of the Spirit for their work all agree. Practically all Christians recognize the necessity for some regular form of ordination, and by almost all this is given by the laying of hands.

The point to be made clear is this. The Ministry of each Christian denomination must be recognized as a true ministry. Its spiritual reality, and efficacy, are proved by its power to bring men to Christ. But it is in each case the Ministry of a particular Communion, holding the commission only of that Communion, and not of the whole Church. All may recognize that for the exercise of the Ministry in the whole Church it is necessary to have the commission of the whole Church. And the commission which has by far the largest sanction, and use, is that given through the historic Episcopate. This was the commission of the whole Church in the past. It is the one accepted by much the larger part of Christendom at the present time. It is manifest that this must be the commission for the exercise of the Ministry of the whole Church in the future. What is now needed is that the Non-Episcopal Ministries shall be recognized to be true Ministries, accepted and used by the Spirit for the work of Christ and that, on the other hand, these Ministries shall accept the Episcopate as giving them the commission requisite

for ministry in the Church Universal. And wider scholarship seems at last to be opening the way for this. A scholar of the Anglican Church, so representative of the Catholic school as the Revd. C. H. Turner writes an essay of which a representative Congregationalist scholar, the Revd. Alfred E. Garvie, Principal of New College, Hampstead, says that it "must have brought relief to others, as to myself, who care for the lessening of the difficulties in the way of Christian reunion. As here presented the Apostolic Succession does not appear an insuperable obstacle." Dr. Garvie adds: "To give to the bishops the place they have hitherto held in respect of the ordination of ministers, so long as, in accordance with ancient practice, other presbyters are associated with them, would be simply to preserve the continuity in the Christian Church which anyone with a proper historic sense would desire. This, however, must not be held to involve any theory of the exclusive validity of episcopal ordination." [1] And the Anglican and Free Church authors of that remarkable statement already referred to, the "Second Interim Report," say, "The first fact which we agree to acknowledge is that the position of Episcopacy in the greater part of Christendom, as the recognized organ of the unity and continuity of the Church, is such that the members of the Episcopal Churches ought not to be expected to abandon it in

[1] See essay by the Revd. A. E. Garvie in *Towards Reunion.*

assenting to any basis of reunion." These representative scholars go on to submit for consideration, as what seem to them "necessary conditions of any possibility of reunion" that "continuity with the historic Episcopate should be effectively preserved"; that "the Episcopate should reassume a constitutional form . . . such as was the primitive ideal and practice" and such as it has "in many Episcopal Communions to-day"; that "acceptance of the fact of Episcopacy, and not any theory as to its character should be all that is asked for," which, they hold "may be the more easily taken for granted as the acceptance of any such theory is not now required of the ministers of the Church of England." And they add, "Within such a recovered unity we should agree in claiming that the legitimate freedom of prophetic ministry should be carefully preserved, and in anticipating that many customs and institutions which have been developed in separate communities may be preserved within the larger unity of which they have come to form a part."

The whole of this report, which may be found in the appendix to this volume, shows striking advance towards mutual understanding and a most generous spirit and earnest desire for unity on the part of its Free Church signers. It may be that the way to reunion would be made easier if those who have received their orders through the historic Episcopate

should on their part express willingness to receive from the authorities of the Non-Episcopal Communions such added and special authorization as they might desire to give. This would of course not be reordination. This term suggests repudiation of, or reflection upon, the Ministry previously exercised and it should therefore not be used on either side. So undoubted an advocate of the Catholic view of the Ministry as the Bishop of Zanzibar has suggested this course. In presenting his plan for the union of the Churches in East Africa he "assured the Conference that if the Non-Episcopal bodies would accept some such proposals as these, and consent to some Episcopal consecration and ordination so as to enable them to minister, by invitation, in Episcopal Churches, he for his part would gladly come before any of their congregations and accept any form of popular recognition. He could not move from his own position, or allow doubt to be cast upon his ministerial authority received by ordination and consecration. But if the Church's forms were held to be weak on the side of popular recognition he would not refuse whatever the other bodies thought to be necessary to make his ministry among them acceptable. This he could do in good faith, since our Lord Jesus Christ, who desires a United Church, knows the thoughts and motives of our hearts." [1]

[1] See Appendix, p. 143.

In regard to worship the Catholic position is associated chiefly with the use of liturgical forms, classic in themselves, hallowed by use and association, coming down, some of them, from the earliest ages of the Christian Church. The Protestant position is associated chiefly with nonliturgical methods, with the free, unprescribed utterance of the spirit in prayer and worship. But as urged in the preceding lecture, why should this question of the method of worship cause separation, or division among us? Neither of these methods is contrary to the principles of the Gospel. Each has its value, and its place. Each may well be used in the life of the Church. The differing views as to forms of worship, use of ritual and, far more important, as to the place and nature of the Sacraments, rest back upon different philosophies of the relation between matter and spirit. Philosophy itself seems now to recognize the reality of both matter and spirit, that spirit is the underlying reality upon which matter depends, and that matter can be, and is, the medium of the spiritual. Those who hold the Sacramental principle, however, find their warrant for it not in any human philosophy, but in the Christian Gospel, which teaches us that all life is holy, and that the body also is to have its place in the redemption. This principle has its supreme and all sufficient exemplification in the fact of the Incarnation, the fact, upon which Christianity wholly rests, that God Himself

was manifested to us in human form, that "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." In this fact historic Christianity has found the Divine authority for the Sacramental principle; for the Sacraments as real channels of the Divine and spiritual; and also for the offering of true spiritual worship through liturgy and ritual. Although liturgical worship has its own acknowledged dangers, its great value and importance in the life of the Church are clear. With striking open-mindedness the authors of *Pathways to Christian Unity* say, "Christian worship, just because it is the worship of the one true God through His complete self-manifestation in our Lord, ought never to be devoid of, nay rather should always be conspicuous for, the reverence with which it is rendered. It is not too much to say that in this matter the average Free Church service of public worship falls gravely short of the standard set by Catholic practice . . . our Free Church worship too frequently lacks in reverence, and tends to substitute other things for the spirit of worship. An ornate liturgical service may be, and doubtless often is, irreverent, and there is such a thing as a drilled reverence which is not worshipful. Nevertheless it is undeniably more difficult to dissociate the spirit of reverence from a Catholic office, or from the Anglican Liturgy, than from our Free Church Services." [1]

[1] Page 114.

As that true soldier of the Spirit, Donald Hankey, expressed it: "We must be quite clear about the object of an ordained priesthood and a uniform service. The English Church always has its eye on the future and on the possibility of a universal Church. Supposing such a Church to exist, it would be almost essential that Christians should be able in every part of the world to take part in the great service of Catholic fellowship, the service of Holy Communion. It is a beautiful idea that wherever a Christian should go in all the world, and in whatever strange language his brothers in Christ might be worshipping, he should always be able to follow this one service, and find it the same everywhere. After all, Holy Communion, enshrining as it does the essence of our faith, is the obvious basis of unity. And there seems to be no good reason why as we all come to understand its meaning more fully there should not in this one thing be uniformity. Therefore, the English Church has tried, as far as possible, to keep to the old form of service in which, from very ancient times, the rite of the breaking of bread and the drinking of the cup has been set. Besides this, the set form of service and the specially ordained ministry are a certain guarantee that the meaning and beauty of the service will not be lost. If it were to be celebrated anyhow, and by anybody, there would be grave danger that false interpretations might creep in, and important features

allowed to drop out. In this matter we think that the Church of England would not serve the cause of ultimate catholicity by sacrificing what seems to be beautiful and useful for the sake of an immediate unity which would mean the impoverishment of the future. Not by giving up what is beautiful and good but by including more of what is beautiful and good, will the Church of England substantiate its claim to be Catholic." [1]

The principle that the outward and visible has its proper place in religion, as in all life, is indeed all but universally accepted. But it must equally be recognized that as to the particular form in which worship shall be offered, and as to the use of ritual, very wide liberty must be conceded. Liturgical forms have great value but it does not therefore follow that there is no place in public worship for free prayer. Precious as the Book of Common Prayer is to Anglicans, noble as it is, both in spirit and in utterance, it is not the only, nor the final, word in worship. It does not meet and cover all the spiritual needs of men of all kinds, on all occasions, and under all conditions. The time has come for the Anglican Church to become less rigid, far more truly Catholic, in her system of worship. Without losing the dignity and order of her stated services she must not only allow, she must encourage greater variety and freedom of devotion. If

[1] *The Lord of All Good Life,* pp. 124, 125.

precedent be required for this it can be found amply in the great variety of ritual, and service books, in earlier days in the Church of England. Catholicism emphasizes the sacramental idea of worship; Protestantism emphasizes the inspirational idea of worship. The thing needed for the life of the Church is that each of these ideas shall have its place and expression. And yet this question of the method of worship has occasioned division in the Body of Christ, and Christians are to-day, more divided in feeling by it than might be supposed.

The trouble is that these different types of worship have in the main, dwelt apart from each other, in separated denominations. It is this fact which makes Christian people critical and suspicious of the method with which they are not familiar. If each method had place, and use, within the one Church the feeling that they are opposed one to another would largely disappear. In the United Church the principle must be not to repress but to combine and develop every variety of religious expression which is in accord with the Faith of Christ. It is this principle which the Anglican Church is now called upon more fully to exemplify.

With regard to the Sacraments, Catholics and Protestants will find their common ground by emphasis upon the fact that the primary thing in these ordinances is not what we do, or feel, but what Christ

does, and gives us, in and through them. A right view of the Sacraments must depend upon, and have as its foundation, a full faith in the living Christ. For all Christians, Catholics and Protestants, the essential, all important fact is that Christianity is the living Christ Himself, showing us the truth, giving us grace and life from above, and doing this normally, and certainly, though we may not say exclusively, through the Church and the Sacraments, which He Himself instituted. Christ is infinitely greater than any of our thoughts and feelings about Him. This is the foundation fact. This is the rock on which the whole life of the Church rests. Standing together in this faith we may gladly allow each other wide diversity of apprehension, and interpretation. In the words of one whom his pupils, and many others, think of as the most profound and illuminating of modern teachers of Christian truth, the late Dr. DuBose, "What we need in our Christianity is to take God at His Word, to believe that what He says to us Christ is. It is as much a part of Christianity to know that Christ is in His Church, as it is to know that God is in Christ. If we truly believed that the Church is Christ's Body, the actual and sole organ and instrument of His life and work upon earth; if we truly knew that we are members of His body, partakers of His life, and doers of all that He is in the world to do; if Baptism were to our faith the death

and life of Christ, and the Bread and Wine were His Body and Blood, instead of only signs of something not there, how would the Gospel begin to manifest itself as that which in itself it is — as that which but for us it would be — the Power of God unto salvation, because a Righteousness of God in us through Faith. With all our mutual understandings and agreements, there will always be certain differences among us, because of certain inevitable liabilities and dangers equally to be found on opposite sides of the above truth of the Church. Some will always be thinking that others are making too much of the outward and visible for the proper emphasis and operation of the inward and spiritual. The others will be equally sure that these are making too much of their own subjective states and selves, and denying, or ignoring, the objective divine presence and grace upon which the internal state is and ought to be directly conditioned. Are not these two opposite attitudes both necessary and wholesome offsets, and does not the truth and life of Christianity depend upon its ability to meet, and compose such differences?" [1]

The crucial question in regard to unity is common participation in the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood. The Lord's Supper is the Sacrament of unity.

[1] "A Constructive Treatment of Christianity," by William Porcher DuBose, *The Constructive Quarterly*, March, 1913, p. 21.

It is the center of the Church's life and worship, the outward sign, and the means, of our fellowship with Christ, and with one another in Him. There can be no true realization of unity until those who are one in Christ can express their fellowship outwardly and visibly in the ordinance of His own appointment. It is for this above all things that we long and pray, for nothing less than this will restore the broken unity of Christ's Church. It is here that the fellowship of Christians must be visibly manifested.

Dr. Newman Smyth truly says: "While the Lord's Supper is the very center and hearth of the whole household of faith, around it have gathered the most irreconcilable differences of the Churches. Reunion therefore must go to the very core of the disunion. So long as non-communion between Churches is visible, real unity is invisible. And belief in the oneness of the invisible Church does not atone for the sinful estate of visible disunity. Agreements to work together outside the churches leave Christ to be found walking the streets among men, but not seen in the midst of His own disciples. External federation in working together, however desirable, may hide, but does not atone for, not living together in the one family and Church of God. The visibility of the real home life,— not of co-workers only in the same field — that is the real unity of the Church." [1]

[1] *Approaches Towards Church Unity*, p. 56.

But between those who hold the Protestant position and those who hold the Catholic position there are important differences of belief as to the meaning of this Sacrament. Is it possible for those who by temperament and conviction hold one of these positions to kneel at the Lord's Supper in fellowship of faith, in unity of mind and spirit with those who by temperament and conviction hold the other position? In spite of their deep differences of apprehension have those who hold the Protestant and Catholic beliefs enough in common to justify them in coming together in this Sacrament to meet their common Lord? Here we must tread reverently for the place on which we stand is holy ground. Because this is the holy of holies, the very sanctuary of the Church's life, there must here be no undue haste. Common participation in this Sacrament is the achievement of unity, its realization and full manifestation to the world. This is the prize for which we are striving. And because it is the prize we must not claim it, until it has been won. This does not say that baptized Christians of other Communions may never be permitted under existing conditions to receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper at an Anglican Altar. Few would be found to maintain this position in practice. But intercommunion between the divided Churches must wait until the way is prepared and ready for it. Intercommunion is the end and climax of our progress to-

wards unity, not its beginning. Writing from the point of view of a Congregationalist, Dr. Raymond Calkins says: "A common communion, before we have acquired the spirit of union or the spiritual perception of the total truth which makes us one, can hardly hasten, but may seriously retard our progress." [1]

As to the question, however, whether Protestants and Catholics can find the way to common participation in this Sacrament is not the answer suggested by the actual situation which we have in the Anglican Church? Within her fold both the Protestant belief and the Catholic belief are in large degree represented and held. Yet all approach the Altar in simple dependence upon Christ's word. All are able to use the great, but sober words of the Prayer Book Office. All believe that in this Sacrament grace is given, and that faith is necessary for its right reception. All believe that there the Bread which cometh down from Heaven is received. All hold that there the one Sacrifice once for all offered on Calvary is kept in remembrance and shown forth before God and men. All believe that there they are in the presence of the living Christ. Why shall not the way be found for Christians of all names to come together to this Sacrament in like unity of simple faith?

In order that the Church may be reunited we must have Catholicism larger, nobler, truer than any that

[1] *Approaches Towards Church Unity*, p. 82.

has yet been attained; a Catholicism larger, not because it has cut loose from the Gospel, but because it has entered more deeply into the Gospel; a Catholicism which is in vital organic relation with the past, but which includes also the spiritual contributions of this age, and of every age since the first days. Those who are most concerned for the integrity of the Faith should most welcome such comprehension. It is in such an atmosphere that the Truth will flourish and find fullest expression. We must have no faithless fear for the Gospel of Christ and His Church. In the atmosphere of brotherliness, mutual sympathy, and freedom we need not fear that truth will suffer. The Catholicism which we now need must be loyal to the Faith once for all revealed, but it must believe also in progress as the very condition of its life, it must rejoice in the new as well as in the old; it must have care for, and sympathy with, all that can bring strength and cheer to the lives of men. It must not look backward to a golden age in the past but must bring all the treasures of the past to the service of the present and the future. It must be at once conservative and progressive, careful to preserve the true foundations of spiritual life, and eager to build boldly and nobly upon them. Those who catch its spirit must have about them the air, not of repression and subjection, but of freedom and adventure, as those who, living in the Father's household, enjoy the glorious

liberty of the children of God. Our lives in the Church are not to be timid, and cautious, and constrained but brave and enterprising and free for "God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." [1]

We must keep in mind the variety and freedom, the life and vigor, the startling innovations, the fearless grappling with new situations as well as the whole-hearted loyalty and faith in Christ which we see in the picture of the Church shown to us in St. Paul's Epistles.

We do grave wrong to Jesus Christ if we allow ourselves to think of, or to present, His religion as a backward looking religion. The cry "Back to Christ" contains truth, but it is only a part of the truth. Our watchword must be not merely "Back to Christ" but "Forward with Christ, and into Christ."

And to the Anglican Communion is given an opportunity without parallel to show what the full life of the Catholic Church may be.

More than ever before we who are of her fold are called to show that the essential principles to which Protestantism bears witness, and the essential principles to which Catholicism bears witness can dwell together in the one Church of Christ. We must do now fully and gladly that which we have been doing half

[1] II Tim. i, 7.

unwillingly and half fearfully. We must cultivate far more the spirit of harmony and unity and mutual confidence in our own household. We must cease thinking of the Catholic and Protestant elements within our Communion as in essential conflict, as though one of these is to overthrow and drive out the other.

We must recognize that each of these positions is seeking to express truth native to the Gospel, that each corresponds with deep facts in human life, that each is needed for the fullness of the Kingdom of God. Such an ideal makes great demands upon us. It calls for largeness of mind and heart in both clergy and people. It requires us indeed to "think magnificently." It means that the Anglican Church must be far more dominated by the spirit of love and fellowship than it has ever yet been, but this is exactly what is now needed, if the Anglican Church and the Church as a whole is to be the effective organ of Christ's power and presence in the world. Patience and forbearance and open-mindedness are not virtues easy to combine with deep conviction. But these are the fruits which the discipline of our common life in the Church, the family of Christ, is intended to produce in us. As one especially qualified to speak on this subject points out, the trouble has been not that the Anglican Church included both the Catholic and Protestant principles, but that she did not carry out this principle far enough. "She followed each too feebly and inconsistently to get

its best out of it and yet sufficiently for to prevent her getting the best out of its fellow." [1]

If the Anglican Church will now follow out to their full implications the principles embodied in her formularies she may play a great part in the reunion of Christendom. Approach towards Rome at this time is not possible. But reunion between the Anglican and the Eastern Churches seems to be near at hand. And there is to-day in the Protestant Churches an eager, almost passionate, desire for unity. If Anglican, Eastern and Protestant Christianity, or a large part of it, could be brought together on a basis of true Christian liberty, with loyalty to essential Catholic principle, this should in no way hinder reunion with the Roman Church, but on the contrary should greatly increase its likelihood. It seems probable that there will have to be such developments before Rome will seriously consider reunion. And there rests upon the Anglican Church a special obligation to strive for religious unity in the English-speaking world. The great Protestant Communions are, many of them, her own kith and kin. She is bound to them by ties of history, of language, and of blood. Some of them went out from her spiritual household, in part through her own fault and shortcoming. Unity, like charity, may well begin at home. As the ancient Church of the English race, identified

[1] *The Church and Religious Unity,* by the Revd. Herbert Kelly, p. 307.

with all its past, what wonder if God is calling us first to seek reconciliation with those who share with us a common heritage, and who read the Bible in the English tongue. The English-speaking peoples are appointed to a great common mission. They are called to stand and strive together, not for any selfish aims or ambitions, but for the good of all mankind. So far as human judgment can see, the peace and hope of the world depend upon their close unity and fellowship. What greater thing could now be accomplished as a step towards unity than the drawing into fellowship of all English-speaking Christians? What greater service could the Anglican Church render than to lend her full strength to this task? If the English-speaking Christians of the world, with the exception, unavoidable for the present, of the Roman Catholics, should become united this would, of itself, open the door to a new coming among us of Jesus Christ, and it would be an immeasurable advance towards that unity of the whole Christian Church for which we must pray and labor without ceasing.

APPENDIX

1. The Lambeth Quadrilateral.
2. Action of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church initiating the movement for a World Conference on Faith and Order.
3. Second Interim Report in connection with the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order.
4. The Bishop of London's Proposals for Reunion between the Church of England and the Wesleyan Methodist Church.
5. The Bishop of Zanzibar's Proposals for Reunion in East Africa.
6. The Concordat. Proposals for an Approach towards Unity prepared by members of the Protestant Episcopal Church and of the Congregational Church in the United States.
7. Plan of Union adopted by the American Council on Organic Union of Churches of Christ. Philadelphia, 1920.
8. The Lambeth Declaration on the Reunion of Christendom. An Appeal to all Christian People.

THE LAMBETH QUADRILATERAL

I

The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as "containing all things necessary to salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of Faith.

II

The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.

III

The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself,— Baptism and the Supper of the Lord,— ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

IV

The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.

ACTION OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH INITIATING THE MOVEMENT FOR A WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER

Document No. I Published by the Joint Commission

At the General Convention of 1910 of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, held in Cincinnati, the following report was presented to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies on October 19, 1910:

The Joint Committee to which was referred the following resolution offered in the House of Deputies by the Rev. W. T. Manning, D.D., of New York:

Resolved, The House of Bishops concurring, That a Joint Committee, consisting of seven Bishops, seven Presbyters and seven Laymen, be appointed to take under advisement the promotion by this Church of a Conference following the general method of the World Missionary Conference, to be participated in by representatives of all Christian bodies throughout the world which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, for the consideration of questions pertaining to the Faith and Order of the Church of Christ, and that said Committee, if it deem such a Conference feasible, shall report to this Convention;

have considered the same, and submit the following report, and recommend the immediate consideration and passage of the resolution appended to the report.

"Your Committee is of one mind. We believe that the time has now arrived when representatives of the whole family of Christ, led by the Holy Spirit, may be willing to come

together for the consideration of questions of Faith and Order. We believe, further, that all Christian Communions are in accord with us in our desire to lay aside self-will, and to put on the mind which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. We would heed this call of the Spirit of God in all lowliness, and with singleness of purpose. We would place ourselves by the side of our fellow Christians, looking not only on our own things, but also on the things of others, convinced that our one hope of mutual understanding is in taking personal counsel together in the spirit of love and forbearance. It is our conviction that such a Conference for the purpose of study and discussion, without power to legislate or to adopt resolutions, is the next step toward unity.

"With grief for our aloofness in the past, and for other faults of pride and self-sufficiency, which make for schism; with loyalty to the truth as we see it, and with respect for the convictions of those who differ from us; holding the belief that the beginnings of unity are to be found in the clear statement and full consideration of those things in which we differ, as well as of those things in which we are at one, we respectfully submit the following resolution:

WHEREAS, There is to-day among all Christian people a growing desire for the fulfillment of Our Lord's prayer that all His disciples may be one; that the world may believe that God has sent Him:

RESOLVED, The House of Bishops concurring, That a Joint Commission be appointed to bring about a Conference for the consideration of questions touching Faith and Order, and that all Christian Communions throughout the world which confess our Lord JESUS CHRIST as God and Saviour be asked to unite with us in arranging for and conducting such a Conference. The Commission shall consist of seven Bishops, appointed by the Chairman of the House of Bishops, and seven Presbyters and seven Laymen, appointed by the President of the House of Deputies, and shall have power to add to its number and to fill any vacancies occurring before the next General Convention:

George W. Peterkin
Boyd Vincent
Thomas F. Gailor
William Lawrence
Charles P. Anderson
Reginald H. Weller
Charles H. Brent
William T. Manning
Alexander Mann
Beverly E. Warner
John E. Sulger
Charles N. Lathrop
William M. Clark
B. Talbot Rogers
Robert H. Gardiner
George Wharton Pepper
Burton Mansfield
Edward P. Bailey
Francis L. Stetson
H. D. W. English
W. A. Robinson

Joint Committee."

On October 19, 1910, the above resolution was adopted unanimously by both the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, and the Joint Commission appointed.

The members of the Commission are:

President: Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson, D.D., Bishop of Chicago, 1612 Prairie Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Chairman of Executive Committee: Rev. William T. Manning, D.D., 27 West 25th Street, New York, N. Y.

Treasurer: George Zabriskie, D.C.L., 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

Secretary: Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Maine.

Rt. Rev. Boyd Vincent, D.D., Bishop of Southern Ohio, 223 West 7th Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Rt. Rev. Thomas F. Gailor, D.D., Bishop of Tennessee, 346 Poplar Street, Memphis, Tennessee.

Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Bishop of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont.

Rt. Rev. C. B. Brewster, D.D., Bishop of Connecticut, Hartford, Connecticut.

Rt. Rev. R. H. Weller, D.D., Bishop Coadjutor of Fond du Lac, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin.

Rt. Rev. C. H. Brent, D.D., Bishop of the Philippine Islands, 253 Calle Nozaleda, Manila, Philippine Islands.

Rt. Rev. David H. Greer, D.D., Bishop of New York, Gramercy Park, New York, N. Y.

Rt. Rev. P. M. Rhinelander, Bishop Coadjutor of Pennsylvania, 12th and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rev. Alexander Mann, D.D.,
233 Clarendon Street, Boston, Massachusetts.
Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D.,
2731 Park Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.
Rev. B. Talbot Rogers, D.D.,
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin.
Rev. William M. Clark, D.D.,
1008 Park Avenue, Richmond, Virginia.
Rev. Edward L. Parsons,
2532 Durant Avenue, Berkeley, California.
Rev. Henry S. Nash, D.D.,
Phillips Place, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Rev. A. G. Mortimer, D.D.,
1625 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Seth Low, LL.D.,
30 East 64th Street, New York, N. Y.
J. Pierpont Morgan, LL.D.,
23 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
George Wharton Pepper, LL.D.,
Land Title and Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
Samuel Mather,
Western Reserve Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
Francis Lynde Stetson,
15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
Edward P. Bailey,
2400 South Park Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.
George Zabriskie, D.C.L.,
49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
Robert H. Gardiner,
Gardiner, Maine.

SECOND INTERIM REPORT

of a Sub-Committee appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York's Committee and by Representatives of the English Free Churches' Commissions, in connection with the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order.

A Movement has been initiated in America by the Protestant Episcopal Church, which has been widely taken up by the Christian Churches in the United States, to prepare for a world-wide conference on Faith and Order with the view of promoting the visible unity of the Body of Christ on earth. In response to an appeal from those who are coöperating in America a committee was appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and commissions by the Free Churches to promote the same Movement in England.

This Joint Conference has already issued a First Interim Report prepared by a Joint Sub-Committee, consisting of: — (1) A Statement of agreement on matters of Faith; (2) A Statement of agreement on matters relating to Order; (3) A Statement of differences in relation to matters of Order which require further study and discussion.

In further pursuit of the main purpose the Sub-Committee was re-appointed and enlarged. After mature and prolonged consideration it is hereby issuing its Second Interim Report under the direction of the Conference as a whole, but on the understanding that the members of the Sub-committee alone are to be held responsible for the substance of the document.

. . . . . .

In issuing our Second Interim Report we desire to prevent possible misconceptions regarding our intentions. We are

engaged, not in formulating any basis of reunion for Christendom, but in preparing for the consideration of such a basis at the projected Conference on Faith and Order. We are exploring the ground in order to discover the ways of approach to the questions to be considered that seem most promising and hopeful. In our first Report we were not attempting to draw up a creed for subscription, but desired to affirm our agreement upon certain foundation truths as the basis of a spiritual and rational creed and life for all mankind in Christ Jesus the Lord. It was a matter of profound gratitude to God that we found ourselves so far in agreement. No less grateful were we that even as regards matters relating to Order we were able to hold certain common convictions, though in regard to these we were forced to recognize differences of interpretation. We felt deeply, however, that we could not let the matter rest there; but that we must in conference seek to understand one another better, in order to discover if even on the questions on which we seemed to differ most we might not come nearer to one another.

1. In all our discussions we were guided by two convictions from which we could not escape, and would not, even if we could.

It is the purpose of our Lord that believers in Him should be one visible society, and this unity is essential to the purpose of Christ for His Church and for its effective witness and work in the world. The conflict among Christian nations has brought home to us with a greater poignancy the disastrous results of the divisions which prevail among Christians, inasmuch as they have hindered that growth of mutual understanding which it should be the function of the Church to foster, and because a Church which is itself divided cannot speak effectively to a divided world.

The visible unity of believers which answers to our Lord's purpose must have its source and sanction, not in any human

arrangements, but in the will of the One Father, manifested in the Son, and effected through the operation of the Spirit; and it must express and maintain the fellowship of His people with one another in Him. Thus the visible unity of the Body of Christ is not adequately expressed in the co-operation of the Christian Churches for moral influence and social service, though such coöperation might with great advantage be carried much further than it is at present; it could only be fully realized through community of worship, faith and order, including common participation in the Lord's Supper. This would be quite compatible with a rich diversity in life and worship.

2. In suggesting the conditions under which this visible unity might be realized we desire to set aside for the present the abstract discussion of the origin of the Episcopate historically, or its authority doctrinally; and to secure for that discussion when it comes, as it must come, at the Conference, an atmosphere congenial not to controversy, but to agreement. This can be done only by facing the actual situation in order to discover if any practical proposals could be made that would bring the Episcopal and Non-Episcopal Communions nearer to one another. Further, the proposals are offered not as a basis for immediate action, but for the sympathetic and generous consideration of all the Churches.

The first fact which we agree to acknowledge is that the position of Episcopacy in the greater part of Christendom as the recognized organ of the unity and continuity of the Church is such that the members of the Episcopal Churches ought not to be expected to abandon it in assenting to any basis of reunion.

The second fact which we agree to acknowledge is that there are a number of Christian Churches not accepting the Episcopal order which have been used by the Holy Spirit in His work of enlightening the world, converting sinners,

and perfecting saints. They came into being through reaction from grave abuses in the Church at the time of their origin, and were led in response to fresh apprehensions of divine truth to give expression to certain types of Christian experience, aspiration and fellowship, and to secure rights of the Christian people which had been neglected or denied.

In view of these two facts, if the visible unity so much desired within the Church and so necessary for the testimony and influence of the Church in the world is ever to be realized, it is imperative that the Episcopal and Non-Episcopal Communions shall approach one another not by the method of human compromise, but in correspondence with God's own way of reconciling differences in Christ Jesus. What we desire to see is not grudging concession, but a willing acceptance for the common enrichment of the united Church of the wealth distinctive of each.

Looking as frankly and as widely as possible at the whole situation, we desire with a due sense of responsibility to submit for the serious consideration of all the parts of a divided Christendom what seem to us the necessary conditions of any possibility of reunion:

1. That continuity with the historic Episcopate should be effectively preserved.

2. That in order that the rights and responsibilities of the whole Christian community in the government of the Church may be adequately recognized, the Episcopate should re-assume a constitutional form, both as regards the method of the election of the bishop as by clergy and people, and the method of government after election. It is perhaps necessary that we should call to mind that such was the primitive ideal and practice of Episcopacy and it so remains in many Episcopal communions to-day.

3. That acceptance of the fact of Episcopacy and not any

theory as to its character should be all that is asked for. We think that this may be the more easily taken for granted as the acceptance of any such theory is not now required of ministers of the Church of England. It would no doubt be necessary before any arrangement for corporate reunion could be made to discuss the exact functions which it may be agreed to recognize as belonging to the Episcopate, but we think this can be left to the future.

The acceptance of Episcopacy on these terms should not involve any Christian community in the necessity of disowning its past, but should enable all to maintain the continuity of their witness and influence as heirs and trustees of types of Christian thought, life and order, not only of value to themselves but of value to the Church as a whole. Accordingly we hope and desire that each of these Communions would bring its own distinctive contribution, not only to the common life of the Church, but also to its methods of organization, and that all that is true in the experience and testimony of the uniting Communions would be conserved to the Church. Within such a recovered unity we should agree in claiming that the legitimate freedom of prophetic ministry should be carefully preserved; and in anticipating that many customs and institutions which have been developed in separate communities may be preserved within the larger unity of which they have come to form a part.

We have carefully avoided any discussion of the merits of any polity, or any advocacy of one form in preference to another. All we have attempted is to show how reunion might be brought about, the conditions of the existing Churches and the convictions held regarding these questions by their members being what they are. As we are persuaded that it is on these lines and these alone that the subject can be approached with any prospect of any measure of agreement, we do earnestly ask the members of the Churches to which we belong to examine carefully our con-

clusions and the facts on which they are based, and to give them all the weight that they deserve.

In putting forward these proposals we do so because it must be felt by all good-hearted Christians as an intolerable burden to find themselves permanently separated in respect of religious worship and communion from those in whose characters and lives they recognize the surest evidences of the indwelling Spirit; and because, as becomes increasingly evident, it is only as a body, praying, taking counsel, and acting together, that the Church can hope to appeal to men as the Body of Christ, that is Christ's visible organ and instrument in the world, in which the Spirit of brotherhood and of love as wide as humanity finds effective expression.

(Signed) G. W. Bath: and Well: (Chairman).
E. Winton:
C. Oxon:
W. T. Davison.
A. E. Garvie.
H. L. Goudge.
J. Scott Lidgett.
W. B. Selbie.
J. H. Shakespeare.
Eugene Stock.
William Temple.
Tissington Tatlow (Hon. Sec.)
H. G. Wood.

March, 1918.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S PROPOSALS FOR RE-UNION BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH

An Extract from an Address by the Bishop of London,[1] February, 1919

Now my suggestion is this: that after a certain date — we will call it the first of January, 1920, though we can hardly expect so early a date — all Ordinations should be so carried out by both Churches as would satisfy the members of them both. You see, the point is this — at once, so to speak, to "run a nick in," at once to get at a point after which the schism shall cease. If you can get first of all a date after which all ordinations will be considered valid by both bodies, you have, however long it takes, arrived at a point after which eventually and automatically the division between the two bodies will cease.

Now, there would be no difficulty whatever from our point of view in this because we have always had presbyters to share with the Bishop the responsibility of ordination.

[1 This Address is one of two Addresses given by the Bishop of London, the first in Kingsway Hall, the second in the Crypt of St. Paul's Cathedral, February and March, 1919. They are printed together under the title of *The Necessity and Hope for Christian Union* and *Problems of Re-Union,* Wells Gardner, Darton & Co. The proposals contained in the Address are the result of two years' Conferences "of an informal character with the Wesleyan Church." These Conferences were attended by important members both of the Church of England and of the Wesleyan Church.]

This seemed to be a surprise to a body of Wesleyans whom I happened to speak to about it. At St. Paul's Cathedral, at ordinations, I always get as many as possible presbyters — or priests, as they are called in our Church — to lay their hands with me on the ordination candidates. Sometimes I have half a dozen, or even a dozen. Therefore the condition would be no difficulty to us, because it is our practice already that with the Bishop there should be presbyters laying their hands upon the candidates for ordination. But you would have to make this change in your ordinations, and with your presbyters there would be a Bishop. After all, when you come to think of it, there is nothing whatever in such a concession as that to upset any of your ideas. I am sure it would not have upset Wesley at all. This, then, is the first point, that there shall be, after a certain date, such ordinations in both bodies as shall satisfy the ideas — scruples, if you like — of members of both bodies.

Then, the idea is that the Wesleyan Church in the reunited Church shall be conserved as an Order or Society or Connection, as it is: just as, if you will take an illustration, though I hope not in exactly the same way, as the Jesuit Order is part of and serves as an order in the Church of Rome. The Methodist Church would continue its class meetings and its Conferences. Mind you, we always have to look out for the enemy who will misrepresent us. The enemy will say that the Methodist Church is going to be absorbed into the Church of England; that is not at all what it is. The Methodist Church would retain its Connection and its order in the reunited Church, which is a very different story, and go on with its habits and its practices undisturbed.

Of the Wesleyan presidents and superintendents, it is suggested that six or more, as is thought advisable, shall be ordained bishops, *per saltum,* as was proposed in the last Lambeth Conference with regard to Presbyterian ministers in Scotland. The object of this is partly to draw the two

bodies together, partly that it might make it easier for Wesleyan ministers who wished, in the manner I am about to describe, voluntarily at once to be ordained. They might prefer to be ordained by their Wesleyan bishops rather than by bishops of the Church of England, though I hope very much to have the pleasure and honor, if this proposed scheme should come into effect, to be allowed myself to take part in the ordination of the Wesleyan ministers, and not let the ordination be confined to those who had become Wesleyan bishops. The more we draw together the better.

Well, up to now, you understand there does not seem to be any great objection or difficulty. But we come to the crux of the matter when we come to what we must call the transitional period. This transitional period depends on the longevity of the existing Wesleyan ministers. I hope they will live a long time, therefore I will give them all, say, forty years at any rate, from the appointed date. We have to think out what would happen during the interval between the date that we fixed and the time when shall have passed away the last Wesleyan minister who does not wish at once, as many will, to receive episcopal ordination, and therefore all the privilegs of a priest in the reunited Church. Some may not wish to do this and therefore we have to think out a plan of how the partially reunited, but not fully reunited Church, should work for those thirty or forty years. I do not myself feel it is very difficult to invent such a plan. All the Wesleyan ministers whom I have the honor of speaking to agree that if they are to be allowed, say, to celebrate the Holy Communion in St. Paul's Cathedral, or a parish church, they must be ordained by the bishop at once. That is to say, they feel quite clearly that our rules are such and our custom is such that it would entirely break up our Church if anything less were required. And a great many, you will find, would like very much the privilege of being admitted full priests and of celebrating in the old parish church, in

perhaps the very place where they have been working, and would rejoice in the opportunity of being ordained soon after the date fixed without waiting for the full reunion, and would claim the privilege, and I hope the joy, of being from our point of view full priests in the reunited Church, with all the rights and duties which that would entail.

Of course, if all were willing to do that, the matter is simple because we have not got to wait so long for the reunited Church. The more who are ordained the quicker the union comes. And just look at the way in which we should supplement, help one another. I should simply love to go round to the Wesleyan churches and preach the Gospel myself, and should find a joy in putting myself side by side with those whose zeal and fervency I have admired for years. And you, my brothers, would find an added joy in celebrating in some beautiful parish church a choral Eucharist. We should both get deeper joy from this union.

Then what about those of the Wesleyan ministry who did not wish to be ordained? I should hold that we must draw up a standard of faith and doctrine upon which we should both agree, on the basis of the Creeds. There is very little difficulty about that with the Wesleyans. The Wesleyan ministers who were not allowed to celebrate as priests in the church on accepting this should be welcomed in our pulpits. When we have drawn that up and arrived, on principle, at union, *then* I am for an exchange of pulpits. That is very different from exchange of pulpits now. We should welcome in such a reunited Church, and welcome gladly, as preachers the Wesleyan ministers — even if they were not reordained to celebrate the Communion — who would exercise their power of preaching.

You would say, "How would you expect, Bishop, the Wesleyan minister, on the principle you laid down, to be ordained and not seem to disregard or deny his orders?" By this suggested form of protestation, which has been ap-

proved by some leading High Churchmen as well as by leading Wesleyans:

> Be it known to all men that the ordination of A B to the office of deacon (or priest) by So-and-So, Lord-Bishop of So-and-So, is not intended by either party to express adverse judgment on the spiritual value of the ministry previously exercised by him, but to provide for the future that his ministrations shall have all the authority committed by God to men for that office such as both parties may recognize without scruple.

You see that declaration frees the consciences both of the Churchman and of the Wesleyan. It frees the conscience of the Wesleyan for he says: "Be it known unto all men" that he is not denying the grace of the Orders he has previously received. The very fact that this would be the recognized form of protestation, used before the service or in the service, is the safeguard that I said was necessary for the Wesleyan minister. It makes it quite clear that there is no *denial* on his part of the value of the Orders which he had received previously.

Well, then we get to the rather more difficult question of Confirmation. Many Wesleyans greatly desire Confirmation fully restored in their Church. Confirmation, I must explain to those who do not realize it, is not looked upon by us as only a form by which the young candidate renews his baptismal vows. That is not really the force of Confirmation in our opinion. Confirmation is the falling of the Holy Spirit on the candidate, and constitutes a fresh gift which he receives. He says, "I do this," "I do that," but that is *preliminary* to the Confirmation, and therefore you will quite understand that when we place Confirmation as a condition of Communion, it is not merely that we are "fencing the Table," but we believe that he does receive in Con-

firmation fresh grace and strength to prepare him for the great privilege that is coming in his first Communion.

When this body of representatives sent from the two Churches really meets, they will have to thrash out this question of the necessity of Confirmation. During those thirty or forty years — and mind you, it will only be for thirty or forty years — we shall have to decide this — whether the full members of the Wesleyan Church, who have passed all their tests, may be received at the Lord's Table without confirmation, and whether we shall carry our Church of England people with us, unless we say that he who comes to the Communion in the parish church must be confirmed first. That is just one of those points we shall have to decide, but do not tell me the whole thing is going to break down over that. I am unsettled in my own mind about it. It is one of those points about which I want to reserve my judgment. It is the only point of real difficulty. I am prepared to hear arguments on both sides. I am certain that after invoking the Holy Spirit at some such Conference of both bodies we shall arrive at a settlement on that issue.

Well, I leave it at that point, as I am only able to give now this outline of the scheme. But if you ask what is to be gained by it, I answer, one rent less in the seamless robe of Christ. If we have mended that we shall save enormous waste. When we put our heads together, when the bishops of the Wesleyans and the bishops of the Church of England look into their buildings together, we shall be able to close this mission church of the Church of England or that mission church of the Wesleyans if they find that they are really competing with, and harming, one another. I hope some of those four little chapels in Canada will be shut up — I hope three will be, but at any rate we might close two. What I believe more than anything is, after all the talk there has been, a little *action* would stimulate the whole cause of Reunion throughout the world, that when once two such

great and respected bodies are united we might approach other bodies with the request —"Will you not join the re-united Church?" The report on "Faith and Order"— I have not time to quote it at length, but you will find it at the end of Mr. Shakespeare's book — the interim report of the sub-committee is the most hopeful report that you could possibly imagine. And that report leads us to hope that if two great bodies like our own really became one it would be of tremendous importance to Reunion throughout the world.

I leave it thus. The necessity is a hard fact. The hope you may call a dream. But if you do I will reply in the words of the well known poem:

Dreamer of dreams! We take the taunt with gladness,
Knowing that God, beyond the years we see,
Has wrought the dream that counts with you for madness
Into the texture of the world to be.

THE BISHOP OF ZANZIBAR'S PROPOSALS, 1918

The following account is given of a speech made at the Conference by the Bishop of Zanzibar. See pp. 7 and 8 of *The Official Report of the Kikuyu Conference, 1918* (C.M.S. Book Room, Salisbury Square, London).

The speech followed immediately on the reading of the "Proposals for an Alliance of Missionary Societies in B.E.A."

"The Chairman then invited Bishop Weston of Zanzibar, who had so kindly accepted the invitation to come to the Conference and take part in its gatherings, to address the delegates. The Bishop was most cordially received, and listened to with eager attention, as he placed before the Conference his view of the controversy which had arisen, and his present proposal for a united church as distinct from the proposals for an alliance of missionary societies — then before the Conference. In his address he set out his own proposals as follows:

1. The acceptance of the fact of Christ's one Church, the Brotherhood of all Christians, into which we all enter by Baptism.

2. The acceptance of the Church's Book, the Holy Bible, as God's Word.

3. The acceptance of the Church's Creeds, the expression of the universal faith.

4. The acceptance of the fact that Episcopacy has always existed, and is to-day in possession of the far greater part of Christendom.

5. Episcopacy need not involve us in a monarchical, dio-

cesan episcopate. Many Bishops may serve one local church. The Bishops should be freely elected, and should rule with the clergy and laity. Nor is it essential that we hold any one view of episcopacy on the doctrinal side, provided the fact of its existence, and continuance, be admitted.

6. Non-episcopal bodies accepting episcopacy would remain in full exercise of their own constitutions, working parallel with the present episcopal churches.

7. The acceptance of the principle of Sacramental Grace. The Gospel Sacraments, so-called, to be used by all, and all bodies to admit the liberty of Christians to those other rites, that the Bishop himself calls Sacraments. He pointed out that the laying-on of hands follows on Baptism.

8. The acceptance of the principle of the Church's Discipline and Absolution, each body to decide how the Absolution be pronounced, whether before the whole people, or in private; and how the preceding confession be made.

9. The acceptance of the principle of Corporate Worship, each body using the form and matter of Baptism, and a valid form of Consecration of the Sacrament of the Holy Communion. In the rest, both in administering Sacraments, and in other times of worship, each body to be left entirely free.

"The Bishop assured the Conference that if the non-episcopal bodies would accept some such proposals as these, and consent to some Episcopal Consecration and ordination so as to enable them to minister, by invitation, in episcopal churches, he for his part would gladly come before any of their congregations, and accept any form of popular recognition.

"He could not move from his own position, or allow doubt to be cast upon his ministerial authority received by ordination, and consecration. But if the Church's forms were held to be weak on the side of popular recognition, he would not refuse whatever the other bodies thought to be necessary

to make his ministry among them acceptable. This he could do in good faith, since our Lord Jesus Christ, who desires a United Church, knows the thoughts and motives of our hearts.

"He laid great stress upon freedom in worship, and did not hide from the Conference the wide tolerance it must exercise, if it desired to include Zanzibar Diocese in its scheme of reunion."

THE CONCORDAT. PROPOSALS FOR AN APPROACH TOWARDS UNITY

Prepared by Members of the Protestant Episcopal Church and of the Congregational Church in the United States, March, 1919

The undersigned, members of the Protestant Episcopal Church and of Congregational Churches, without any official sanction and purely on our private initiative, have conferred with each other, partly by correspondence and partly by meeting, with a view to discover a method by which a practical approach towards making clear and evident the visible unity of believers in our Lord according to His will, might be made. For there can be no question that such is our Lord's will. The Church itself in the midst of its divisions, bears convincing witness to it. "There is one Body and one Spirit, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism." There has never been, there can never be, more than one Body or one Baptism. On this we are agreed. There is one fellowship of the Baptized, made one by grace, and in every case by the self-same grace. And the unity given and symbolized by Baptism is in its very nature visible.

We are agreed that it is our Lord's purpose that believers in Him should be one visible society. Into such a society, which we recognize as the Holy Catholic Church, they are initiated by Baptism; whereby they are admitted to fellowship with Him and with one another. The unity which is essential to His Church's effective witness and work in the world must express and maintain this fellowship. It cannot be fully realized without community of worship, faith, and order, including common participation in the Lord's Supper.

Such unity would be compatible with a rich diversity in life and worship.

We have not discussed the origin of the episcopate historically or its authority doctrinally; but we agree to acknowledge that the recognized position of the episcopate in the greater part of Christendom as the normal nucleus of the Church's ministry and as the organ of the unity and continuity of the Church is such that the members of the episcopal Churches ought not to be expected to abandon it in assenting to any basis of reunion.

We also agree to acknowledge that Christian Churches not accepting the episcopal order have been used by the Holy Spirit in His work of enlightening the world, converting sinners, and perfecting saints. They came into being through reactions from grave abuses in the Church at the time of their origin, and were led in response to fresh apprehensions of divine truth to give expression to certain necessary and permanent types of Christian experience, aspiration and fellowship, and to secure rights of Christian people which had been neglected or denied.

No Christian community is involved in the necessity of disowning its past; but it should bring its own distinctive contribution not only to the common life of the Church, but also to its methods of organization. Many customs and institutions which have been developed in separate communities may be preserved within the larger unity. What we desire to see is not grudging concession, but a willing acceptance of the treasures of each for the common enrichment of the united Church.

To give full effect to these principles in relation to the Churches to which we respectively belong requires some form of corporate union between them. We greatly desire such corporate union. We also are conscious of the difficulties in the way of bringing it about, including the necessity for corporate action, even with complete good-

will on both sides. In this situation we believe that a practical approach toward eventual union may be made by the establishment of intercommunion in particular instances. It is evident to us that corporate union between bodies whose members have become so related will thereby be facilitated. Mutual understanding and sympathy will strongly reinforce the desire to be united in a common faith and order, and will make clearer how the respective contributions of each community can best be made available to all.

We recognize as a fact, without discussing whether it is based upon sound foundations, that in the Episcopal Churches an apprehension exists that if episcopally-conferred orders were added to the authority which non-episcopal ministers have received from their own communions, such orders might not be received and used in all cases in the sense or with the intention with which they are conferred. Upon this point there ought to be no room for doubt. The sense or intention in which any particular order of the ministry is conferred or accepted is the sense or intention in which it is held in the Universal Church. In conferring or in accepting such ordination neither the bishop ordaining nor the minister ordained should be understood to impugn thereby the efficacy of the minister's previous ministry.

The like principle applies to the ministration of sacraments. The minister acts not merely as the representative of the particular congregation then present, but in a larger sense he represents the Church Universal; and his intention and meaning should be our Lord's intention and meaning as delivered to and held by the Catholic Church. To this end such sacramental matter and form should be used as shall exhibit the intention of the Church.

When communion has been established between the ordaining bishop of the Episcopal Church and the ordained minister of another communion, appropriate measures ought to be devised to maintain it by participating in the sacra-

ment of the Lord's Supper and by mutual counsel and co-operation.

We are not unmindful that occasions may arise when it might become necessary to take cognizance of supposed error of faith or of conduct, and suitable provisions ought to be made for such cases.

In view of the limitations imposed by the law and practice of the Episcopal Church upon its bishops with regard to ordination, and the necessity of obtaining the approval of the General Convention of the Episcopal Church to the project we have devised, a form of canonical sanction has been prepared which is appended as a schedule to this statement. We who are members of the Episcopal Church are prepared to recommend its enactment. We who are members of Congregational Churches regard it as a wise basis upon which in the interests of Church unity, and without sacrifice on either side, the supplementary ordination herein contemplated might be accepted.

It is our conviction that such procedure as we here outline is in accordance, as far as it goes, with our Lord's purposes for His Church; and our fond hope is that it would contribute to heal the Church's divisions. In the mission field it might prove of great value in uniting the work. In small communities it might put an end to the familiar scandal of more churches than the spiritual needs of the people require. In the army and navy, chaplains so ordained could minister acceptably to the adherents of Christian bodies who feel compunctions about the regularity of a non-episcopal ministry. In all places an example of a practical approach to Christian unity, with the recognition of diversities in organization and in worship, would be held up before the world. The will to unity would be strengthened, prejudices would be weakened, and the way would become open in the light of experience to bring about a more complete organic unity of Christian Churches.

While this plan is the result of conference in which members of only one denomination of non-episcopal Churches have taken part, it is comprehensive enough to include in its scope ministers of all other non-episcopal communions; and we earnestly invite their sympathetic consideration and concurrence.

New York, March 12, 1919.

Boyd Vincent, Bishop of Southern Ohio.

Philip M. Rhinelander, Bishop of Pennsylvania.

Wm. Cabell Brown, Bishop of Virginia.

Hughell Fosbroke, Dean of the Gen. Theol. Seminary.

William T. Manning, Rector of Trinity Church, New York.

Charles L. Slattery, Rector of Grace Church, New York.

Howard B. St. George, Professor in Nashotah Seminary.

Francis Lynde Stetson.

Robert H. Gardiner.

George Zabriskie, Chancellor of the Diocese of New York. Hon. Sec., 23 Gramercy Park, New York.

William H. Day, Moderator of Congregational National Council.

Hubert C. Herring, Sec. of National Council.

Charles F. Carter, Chairman of Ex. Committee of National Council.

Williston Walker, of the Commission on Organization.

Herbert S. Smith, of Commission on Unity.

William E. Barton, of Commission on Organization.

Nehemiah Boynton, Ex. Moderator of National Council.

Raymond Calkins, Chairman of Congregational Commission on Unity.

Arthur F. Pratt, Sec. of Commission on Unity.

William T. McElveen, of Commission on Unity.

Newman Smyth, of Commission on Unity. Hon. Sec., 54 Trumbull Street, New Haven, Conn.

Schedule

FORM OF PROPOSED CANON

§ I. In case any minister who has not received episcopal ordination shall desire to be ordained by a Bishop of this Church to the Diaconate and to the Priesthood without giving up or denying his membership or his ministry in the Communion to which he belongs, the Bishop of the Diocese or Missionary District in which he lives, with the advice and consent of the Standing Committee or the Council of Advice, may confirm and ordain him.

§ II. The minister desiring to be so ordained shall satisfy the Bishop that he has resided in the United States at least one year; that he has been duly baptized with water in the name of the Trinity; that he holds the historic faith of the Church as contained in the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed; that there is no sufficient objection on grounds physical, mental, moral or spiritual; and that the ecclesiastical authority to which he is subject in the Communion to which he belongs consents to such ordination.

§ III. At the time of his ordination the person to be ordained shall subscribe and make in the presence of the Bishop a declaration that he believes the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God and to contain all things necessary to salvation; that in the ministration of Baptism he will unfailingly baptize with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; and (if he is being ordained to the Priesthood) that in the celebration of the Holy Communion he will invariably use the elements of bread and wine, and will include in the service the words and acts of our Lord in the institution of the Sacrament, the Lord's Prayer, and (unless one of these Creeds has been used in the service immediately preceding the celebration of the Holy Communion)

the Apostles' or the Nicene Creed as the symbol of the faith of the Holy Catholic Church; that when thereto invited by the Bishop of this Church having jurisdiction in the place where he lives, he will (unless unavoidably prevented) meet with such Bishop for Communion and for counsel and coöperation; and that he will hold himself answerable to the Bishop of this Church having jurisdiction in the place where he lives, or, if there be no such Bishop, to the Presiding Bishop of this Church, in case he be called in question with respect to error of faith or of conduct.

§ IV. In case a person so ordained be charged with error of faith or of conduct he shall have reasonable notice of the charge and reasonable opportunity to be heard, and the procedure shall be similar to the procedure in the case of a clergyman of this Church charged with the like offense. The sentence shall always be pronounced by the Bishop and shall be such as a clergyman of this Church would be liable to. It shall be certified to the ecclesiastical authority to which the defendant is responsible in any other Communion. If he shall have been tried before a tribunal of the Communion in which he has exercised his ministry, the judgment of such tribunal proceeding in the due exercise of its jurisdiction shall be taken as conclusive evidence of facts thereby adjudged.

§ V. A minister so ordained may officiate in a Diocese or Missionary District of this Church when licensed by the ecclesiastical authority thereof, but he shall not become the Rector or a minister of any parish or congregation of this Church until he shall have subscribed and made to the Ordinary a declaration in writing whereby he shall solemnly engage to conform to the doctrine, discipline and worship of this Church. Upon his making such declaration and being duly elected Rector or minister of a parish or congregation of this Church, and complying with the canons of this Church and of the Diocese or Missionary District in that

behalf, he shall become for all purposes a Minister of this Church.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL CONVENTION

WHEREAS, at sundry times in past years, and especially in 1853, in 1880, and in 1886, this General Convention, and the House of Bishops thereof, did set forth certain declarations relating to the Unity of the Church and the steps which, under God, might be taken to lead to such Unity;

AND WHEREAS, there have now been laid before General Convention certain "Proposals for an Approach towards Unity," to which are attached the signatures of distinguished members of Congregational Churches and of this Church, which proposals ask for the enactment of appropriate legislation whereby a Bishop may be authorized to confer the orders of the Diaconate and the Priesthood upon Ministers who have not received Episcopal ordination, under certain conditions therein enumerated;

AND WHEREAS, these Proposals afford a hopeful basis for negotiations looking toward that end,

Be it Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring:

I. That the General Convention recognizes with profound gratitude to Almighty God the earnest desire of these representative members of Congregational Churches and of this Church to find a way by which the first step towards eventual Church unity may be taken, and especially the irenic attitude of those who are not in communion with this Church, but who have indicated their desire to enter into certain relations with it for the furtherance of that unity for which we together pray.

II. That as a step toward the accomplishment of so great a purpose, this Church hereby declares its willingness to initiate action which may make possible the ordination as Deacons and as Priests of Ministers in other Christian bodies who accept the Holy Scriptures as the revealed

Word of God, the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith, and the Sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, under conditions which are stated in the aforementioned Proposals for an Approach toward Unity, whenever evidence shall be laid by any such applicant Minister before the Bishop of this Church having jurisdiction in the place in which such Minister resides of his acceptance of the principles set forth in those Proposals.

We, however, direct the Joint Commission to be constituted that in proposing such legislation the following points shall be carefully considered:

(*a*) That the Congregation, if any, in which such Minister officiates shall declare through its accustomed representatives its desire for such ordination on behalf of its Minister and its purpose to receive in future the ministrations and the sacraments of one who shall have been ordained to the Priesthood by a Bishop.

(*b*) That every Minister so ordained shall, in celebrating Holy Communion, invariably incorporate in a Prayer of Consecration the Words of Our Lord in instituting that Sacrament, and also a suitable Oblation and Invocation of the Holy Spirit.

(*c*) That he shall in no case administer the Holy Communion to an unbaptized person. And this Church will hopefully anticipate the use of the Apostolic practice of Confirmation.

III. That a Joint Commission of five Bishops, five Presbyters, and five Laymen be appointed to continue conference with the Congregational Signatories to the said "Proposals," and to report to the next General Convention.

PLAN OF UNION ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION OF CHURCHES OF CHRIST

HELD IN WITHERSPOON HALL, PHILADELPHIA, PA.
FEBRUARY 3–6, 1920

This Council instructs the Ad Interim Committee to present the Plan to the supreme governing or advisory bodies of the several communions in such manner as the Committee shall devise and at its discretion to such other evangelical denominations as may not here be represented.

WILLIAM H. ROBERTS, *President,* Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
RUFUS W. MILLER, *Secretary,* 15th and Race Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

PREAMBLE:

WHEREAS: We desire to share, as a common heritage, the faith of the Christian Church, which has, from time to time, found expression in great historic statements; and

WHEREAS: We all share belief in God our Father; in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Saviour; in the Holy Spirit, our Guide and Comforter; in the Holy Catholic Church, through which God's eternal purpose of salvation is to be proclaimed and the Kingdom of God is to be realized on earth; in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing God's revealed will, and in the life eternal; and

WHEREAS: Having the same spirit and owning the same Lord, we none the less recognize diversity of gifts and ministrations for whose exercise due freedom must always be afforded in forms of worship and in modes of operation:

PLAN:

Now, we the Churches hereto assenting as hereinafter provided in Article VI do hereby agree to associate ourselves in a visible body to be known as the "United Churches of Christ in America," for the furtherance of the redemptive work of Christ in the world. This body shall exercise in behalf of the constituent Churches the functions delegated to it by this instrument, or by subsequent action of the constituent Churches, which shall retain the full freedom at present enjoyed by them in all matters not so delegated.

Accordingly, the Churches hereto assenting and hereafter thus associated in such visible body do mutually covenant and agree as follows:

I. *Autonomy in purely denominational affairs.*

In the interest of the freedom of each and of the coöperation of all, each constituent Church reserves the right to retain its credal statements, its form of government in the conduct of its own affairs, and its particular mode of worship:

In taking this step, we look forward with confident hope to that complete unity toward which we believe the Spirit of God is leading us. Once we shall have coöperated wholeheartedly, in such visible body, in the holy activities of the work of the Church, we are persuaded that our differences will be minimized and our union become more vital and effectual.

II. *The Council.* (How Constituted.)

The United Churches of Christ in America shall act through a Council and through such Executive and Judicial Commissions, or Administrative Boards, working *ad interim,* as such Council may from time to time appoint and ordain.

The Council shall convene as provided for in Article VI and every second year thereafter. It may also be convened

at any time in such manner as its own rules may prescribe. The Council shall be a representative body.

Each constituent Church shall be entitled to representation therein by an equal number of ministers and of lay members.

The basis of representation shall be: two ministers and two lay members for the first one hundred thousand or fraction thereof of its communicants; and two ministers and two lay members for each additional one hundred thousand or major fraction thereof.

III. *The Council.* (Its Working.)

The Council shall adopt and promulgate its own By-Laws and rules of procedure and order. It shall define the functions of its own officers, prescribe the mode of their selection and their compensation, if any. It shall provide for its budget of expense by equitable apportionment of the same among the constituent Churches through their supreme governing or advisory bodies.

IV. *Relation of Council and Constituent Churches.*

The supreme governing or advisory bodies of the constituent Churches shall effectuate the decisions of the Council by general or specific deliverance or other mandate whenever it may be required by the law of a particular state, or the charter of a particular Board, or other ecclesiastical corporation; but, except as limited by this Plan, shall continue the exercise of their several powers and functions as the same exist under the denominational constitution.

The Council shall give full faith and credit to the authenticated acts and records of the several governing or advisory bodies of the constituent Churches.

V. *Specific Functions of the Council.*

In order to prevent overlapping, friction, competition or

waste in the work of the existing denominational boards or administrative agencies, and to further the efficiency of that degree of coöperation which they have already achieved in their work at home and abroad:

(*a*) The Council shall harmonize and unify the work of the United Churches.

(*b*) It shall direct such consolidation of their missionary activities as well as of particular Churches in over-churched areas as is consonant with the law of the land or of the particular denomination affected. Such consolidation may be progressively achieved, as by the uniting of the boards or Churches of any two or more constituent denominations, or may be accelerated, delayed, or dispensed with, as the interests of the Kingdom of God may require.

(*c*) If and when any two or more constituent Churches, by their supreme governing or advisory bodies, submit to the Council for its arbitrament any matter of mutual concern, not hereby already covered, the Council shall consider and pass upon such matter so submitted.

(*d*) The Council shall undertake inspirational and educational leadership of such sort and measure as may be proper, under the powers delegated to it by the constituent Churches in the fields of Evangelism, Social Service, Religious Education, and the like.

VI. The assent of each constituent Church to this Plan shall be certified from its supreme governing or advisory body by the appropriate officers thereof to the Chairman of the Ad Interim Committee, which shall have power upon a two-thirds vote to convene the Council as soon as the assent of at least six denominations shall have been so certified.

VII. *Amendments.*

This plan of organic union shall be subject to amendment only by the constituent Churches, but the Council may overture to such bodies any amendment which shall have origin-

ated in said Council and shall have been adopted by a three-fourths vote.

NOTE: The Churches represented in the Council were the Armenian, Baptist, The Christian Church, Christian Union of United States, Congregational, Disciples, Evangelical Synod of North America, Friends (two branches), Methodist (Primitive), Methodist Episcopal, Moravian, Presbyterian Church in United States of America, Protestant Episcopal, Reformed Episcopal, Reformed Church in the United States, United Presbyterian, Welsh Presbyterian.

" The attention of the constituent Churches is called to the fact that the assent called for by Article VI of the Plan should be secured in conformity with the constitution of each constituent Church.

DECLARATION ON THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM

Issued by the Archbishops and Bishops of the Anglican Communion Assembled in Conference at Lambeth Palace, August, 1920

An appeal to all christian people

We, Archbishops, Bishops, Metropolitans, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, in Conference assembled, realizing the responsibility which rests upon us at this time, and sensible of the sympathy and the prayers of many, both within and without our own Communion, make this appeal to all Christian people.

We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body. We believe that the Holy Spirit has called us in a very solemn and special manner to associate ourselves in penitence and prayer with all those who deplore the divisions of Christian people, and are inspired by the vision and hope of a visible unity of the whole Church.

I. We believe that God wills fellowship. By God's own act this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in His Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible, and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers, using God-

given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church.

II. This united fellowship is not visible in the world today. On the one hand there are other ancient episcopal Communions in East and West, to whom ours is bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. On the other hand there are the great non-episcopal Communions, standing for rich elements of truth, liberty, and life which might otherwise have been obscured or neglected. With them we are closely linked by many affinities, racial, historical, and spiritual. We cherish the earnest hope that all these Communions, and our own, may be led by the Spirit into the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. But in fact we are all organized in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship, and tending to live its own life apart from the rest.

III. The causes of division lie deep in the past, and are by no means simple or wholly blameworthy. Yet none can doubt that self-will, ambition, and lack of charity among Christians have been principal factors in the mingled process, and that these, together with blindness to the sin of disunion, are still mainly responsible for the breaches of Christendom. We acknowledge this condition of broken fellowship to be contrary to God's will, and we desire frankly to confess our share in the guilt of thus crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of His Spirit.

IV. The times call us to a new outlook and new measures. The Faith cannot be adequately apprehended and the battle of the Kingdom cannot be worthily fought while the body is divided, and is thus unable to grow up into the fullness of the life of Christ. The time has come, we believe, for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal

of a reunited Catholic Church. The removal of the barriers which have arisen between them will only be brought about by a new comradeship of those whose faces are definitely set this way.

The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all "who profess and call themselves Christians," within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian Communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled.

V. This means an adventure of goodwill and still more of faith, for nothing less is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God. To this adventure we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church.

VI. We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:

The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief:

The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ:

A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.

VII. May we not reasonably claim that the episcopate is

the one means of providing such a ministry? It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those communions which do not possess the episcopate. On the contrary we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. But we submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim which we make on behalf of the episcopate. Moreover, we would urge that it is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church. But we greatly desire that the office of a bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian Family in the title of Father-in-God. Nay more, we eagerly look forward to the day when through its acceptance in a united Church we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body in the apostolic rite of the laying-on of hands, and in the joy and fellowship of a Eucharist in which as one family we may together, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the one Lord our worship and service.

VIII. We believe that, for all, the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences. To this end, we who send forth this appeal would say that if the authorities of other Communions should so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, bishops and clergy of our communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. It is not in our power to know how far this suggestion may be acceptable to those to whom we offer it. We can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministries of grace, theirs and

ours, shall be available for the service of our Lord in a united Church.

It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship.

In so acting no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry. God forbid that any man should repudiate a past experience rich in spiritual blessings for himself and others. Nor would any of us be dishonoring the Holy Spirit of God, whose call led us all to our several ministries, and whose power enabled us to perform them. We shall be publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call to wider service in a reunited Church, and imploring for ourselves God's grace and strength to fulfill the same.

IX. The spiritual leadership of the Catholic Church in days to come, for which the world is manifestly waiting, depends upon the readiness with which each group is prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of a common fellowship, a common ministry, and a common service to the world.

We place this ideal first and foremost before ourselves and our own people. We call upon them to make the effort to meet the demands of a new age with a new outlook. To all other Christian people whom our words may reach we make the same appeal. We do not ask that any one Communion should consent to be absorbed in another. We do ask that all should unite in a new and great endeavor to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which He prayed.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

AI

CINCINNATI BIBLE COLLEGE & SEM. LIBRARY
262.0011 M284c main
Manning, William Th/The call to unity ;
3 4320 00058 2348

DATE DUE
DEC 15 '00
GEORGE MARK ELLIOTT LIBRARY
The Cincinnati Bible Seminary
262.0011 M284c
Manning, William Thomas.
The call to unity